THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

FOURTH SERIES—VOL. II.—(XXXII).—JANUARY, 1905.—NO. 1.

THE FOUNDERS OF THE CHURCH IN IDAHO.

[The original MS. letters of Bishop Lootens to Father Mesplié, which are here printed for the first time, were obtained through the courtesy of the Rev. Joseph Van der Heyden, of Boise Diocese, at present professor at the American College, Louvain, Belgium.]

AMONG the brave and self-sacrificing early missionaries of Western America, few figure more prominently than does Bishop Louis Lootens, the first Vicar Apostolic, and Father Toussaint Mesplié, the pioneer secular priest of Idaho. The former was born in Bruges, Belgium, and educated partly there and partly in Paris. Ordained in the French Capital by the first Bishop of Vancouver, Modest Demers, he came with him to Victoria in August, 1852, terminating the long and tedious journey by an Indian canoe-ride across Puget Sound.

The latter, a native of France, was brought to Oregon whilst still in minor orders by its saintly pioneer priest and archbishop, F. N. Blanchet, who raised him to the sacred priesthood in his young archdiocese at St. Paul in 1847. In September of that year Father Mesplié began his ministry among the Calapuyas, Malalies and Tualotins in Willamette Valley. In 1849 he established a mission among the Chinooks at the mouth of the Columbia River, whence he attended the soldiers at Fort Astoria, as also the Chehalis, Clapsacks, and other tribes living along the banks of the Columbia up to Fort Vancouver. The evangelization of these Indians was labor indeed, demoralized as they were, not merely by their wild lives but through many years' contact with rude sailors and unprincipled White traders and their associates. Nevertheless the natives gradually yielded to the zealous priest's

efforts and had become greatly improved when in December, 1850, he was transferred from the ministry of these tribes, whose languages he had laboriously acquired, to The Dalles region. Thence he evangelized and attended to the spiritual needs of the Wascos, Wisrams, Fair Valley Indians, Tininos, Deschartes, Dog River, and other confederated tribes who were later brought together at the Warm Springs Reservation. He labored among these tribes from February 3, 1851, until June 15, 1863. Nor were his services limited to them. Meanwhile he periodically visited the Yaquimas, the Kliquitats, the Cayuse, the Wallulas, and Walla Wallas. No higher tribute to the Black Gown's worth can be found than the constant acquiescence of these savages in his counsels during periods of wild excitement and irritation, when even the most civilized tribes could hardly be induced to yield to sober and wise judgment. During the three years' struggle which broke out in the autumn of 1855, Father Mesplié kept thousands of Indians from the warpath; he pacified large numbers among the chiefs who had commenced hostilities; and by keeping the military authorities informed of the plots of hostile tribes, he saved not only The Dalles City from destruction, but also many lives of those whom the Government employed as a defence of the valuable interests in that region. In his ceaseless journeys he had occasion often to protect by his interposition the lives of travellers who were the natural prey of the revengeful hordes of cruel natives. After the latter destroyed Cascades City in the autumn of 1856, our missioner's influence with the Indians of Oregon, and later with those of Idaho, put an effective check to their habit of plundering towns, mining-camps, and stage-coaches.

It was in the spring of 1862 when twelve sturdy miners started from Auburn, Ore., on a prospecting tour. They discovered gold mines in what is now Boise County, Idaho, and were exploiting their new find with great glee when the Indians suddenly came upon them and killed the leader of their party. The eleven men, realizing their weakness numerically and the impossibility of making a defence, managed under cover of their weapons to escape, and retreated to Walla Walla, Washington, whence they returned, fifty-four men strong, in October of the same year to the

newly found gold-field. About four miles below their pioneer's lonely grave, they erected a stockade fort which they called Fort Hog'em. This prosaic name was shortly afterwards changed, first to New Dublin, as a compliment to the predominance in the party of Irishmen, and later on to Pioneer, which name it kept. To this, one of the first permanent settlements of Idaho, Father Mesplié repaired by order of Archbishop Blanchet in June, 1863. He had to travel 500 miles, by boat, from Portland to Umatilla, and through an apparently endless stretch of sagebrush country by stage. Idaho City and Centerville were doubtless his first halting places in the new Territory of Idaho, established by Act of Congress on March 3d of that same year. As these towns were rapidly growing in population, requiring missionary care, another priest, Father A. Z. Poulin, born in Canada, was ordered to join Father Mesplié, and did so a few months after the arrival of the latter. These two zealous missionaries labored with all their energy, and in less than one year they had the consolation of seeing this virgin portion of the Lord's vineyard graced by four cross-topped churches. They were located at Idaho City, Placerville, Centerville, and Pioneer, the first and largest of them having been erected at a cost of between $3,000 and $4,000. But for the general prosperity of all these camps—$18 a day being ordinary miner's wages in the spring of 1863, and claims panning out from $200 to $1,500 a day—many toilers would probably have lived in tents, as lumber cost $100 a thousand feet, and carpenter's wages ranged from $6 up.

Before providing a house of worship for Pioneer, Father Mesplié set about the task of renovating the spiritual temple of the new and somewhat untrained congregation that had gathered in the settlement. He began his work with a thirteen days' mission at which a very large number received the Sacraments. This was in January, 1864. When by this means the miners had been fully awakened to the need of a tabernacle for our dear Lord, he began the building of the material edifice which was to be the first white people's church in Idaho. It was completed and dedicated in the summer of 1864, and consisted of a twenty by forty feet wooden structure, with comfortable rooms in the rear for the priest. The original framework had served as a store and was

purchased for $1,000. The re-modeling cost another $1,000. Later on, when the town had been deserted, as was the fate of hundreds of whilom flourishing mining camps in that region, this little church was scrupulously cared for until Father Mesplié's final departure in 1887, by a Belgian layman familiarly known as John "the priest." He had been for many years a most faithful and exemplary representative of the actual pastor, as a teacher of the young on Sundays. Afterwards, the forsaken and crumbling edifice was sold, and is now, sad to say, used as a barn.

How much Father Mesplié and his little flock had at heart the beauty of God's House is attested by the records of that time. The *Idaho World*, under date of November 19, 1864, referring to the improvements of the church in the city (Idaho) writes: "It is becoming one of the ornaments of our town;" and Elliot's *History of Idaho* relates in detail how the people were interested in the preservation of the edifice to which every man, woman, and child of the town and vicinity had contributed; so that when on May 20, 1865, the entire business portion of Idaho City was laid in ashes, the Catholic church was practically the only building saved, thanks to the extraordinary efforts of the people, there being at one time at least one hundred men on its roof fighting the flames.

Two months later, in a note to the *Idaho World*, Father Mesplié made bold to turn the thoughts of the crowds who attended a grand ball in the town to nobler things by exhorting them to devote some efforts and financial aid to the sick who, since the burning of the hospital, had been sheltered in the church, and this under the care of Father Poulin, who faithfully carried out the maxim of his Master, who had said, "Whatsoever ye have done to the least of My brethren, ye have done it unto Myself."

In a letter of June 24, 1865, to the same *Idaho World*, our missionary endeavored to discourage the wild enthusiasm attending the first opening of the Cœur d'Alene mining district. Many who had been drawn by the general excitement to prospect found themselves disappointed, and a month after the opening the newspaper in Idaho published the statement that "intelligence [is] received by Father Mesplié that hundreds of destitute men were camped around the Cœur d'Alene Mission, being fed by the

Jesuit Fathers. No more gold has been discovered in that country. Men are leaving it in droves. It has turned out the greatest humbug of the age." In the same tenor, Captain John Mullen writes in *The Miners and Travellers' Guide* for 1865: "The Jesuit mission has always proved to the weary traveller and destitute emigrant a St. Bernard in the Cœur d'Alene mountains." It is nevertheless true that the Cœur d'Alene mines, discovered in 1883 and the following years, yielded big fortunes to their discoverers. The Bunker Hill, Sullivan, and Gem mines alone produced upwards of ten million dollars each in silver and lead, being probably the greatest lead property in the world, not excepting the Broken Hills mine in Australia.

Under date of September 9, 1865, the *Idaho World* commented on the scarcity of glad or any other tidings preached in Boise Basin, save in the Catholic church; the Protestant meeting-hall had been converted into a court house.

On May 17, 1867, Idaho City was again destroyed by fire; and this time St. Joseph's Church, which had been saved two years before, was burned to the ground, despite strenuous exertions of bands of intrepid and devoted men to keep the flames from it. The loss amounted to about $8,500, whilst the property that was rescued was worth about $1,500.

A striking proof of the buoyant character and persevering activity of Fathers Mesplié and Poulin is given in the fact that by June 1st, that is, within two weeks after the conflagration, they had raised up a new building, part of which had to serve them as residence, and part as a temporary chapel. By the 26th of the same month they had begun the construction of a handsome new church in honor of St. Joseph, of which the *Idaho World* of July 24th said: "Though not quite completed, it already presented the finest appearance of any building in the city."

Now, gentle reader, mark what follows. If Catholic politicians and legislators throughout the United States had been as wide-awake and as alive to our most sacred interests and our unquestioned civil rights as were the Idaho Catholics of 1867, the unfair system of public-school taxation without representation would long since have been repealed; and ten to twelve million citizens of this fair land of the free would not be compelled to

support schools to which they cannot in conscience send their children.

In the Territorial Legislature of January, 1867, a bill was passed appropriating $30,000 for the maintenance of Catholic schools. It proposed to have the Controller issue Territorial bonds to that amount drawn in favor of F. N. Blanchet, Archbishop of Oregon, bearing interest at the rate of 10 per cent. a year, redeemable out of funds accruing from the sale of school-land sections. The Boise City *Weekly Statesman* (January 10, 1867) denounced the measure in the most vigorous terms: "The title of it should be: An act to rob the common school fund and to establish the Catholic religion in Idaho Territory. . . . The bill received a most terrible scoring at the hands of the members of the House when it came up, but it was no use; the party lash was applied, and it went through by a close vote. In plain English, it was gotten up for the purpose of securing the influence of the Catholic priesthood for the Democratic party. . . ." A special issue of the same journal two days later had this editorial: "Dead.—With profound pleasure we record that the House sustained the Governor's veto of the Bill establishing the Catholic religion. The feeling in the House and throughout the community upon the question has been for several days most intense. The debate was excited and angry, and epithets were freely used . . ."

Comments upon this one-sided exposition of public opinion are superfluous. Looking to-day at the abortive bill of those times, we are still convinced that, whatever the motives of its promoters, the principle that underlay it was one of strict equity. Catholics constituted then, as they do now, a goodly fraction of the tax-payers and of the upbuilders of the country. Why should they not be entitled to the quota of their school fund contributions, and why could not parents therewith provide for their offspring such education as they choose? Catholics are most willing to grant Protestants equal rights and favors. The very initiative thus presented by the alert and brave Catholics of Idaho was like an invitation to Protestants to seek equal rights for their children. No matter how divided in their religious interpretation these Christians were, they all accepted, if they did not rest their faith upon

the word of God as written in the Bible, which would have served them as a generally approved text-book of their religion.

It is doubtful whether the Catholic Sisters were aware of the above-mentioned legislative attempts to secure their services for Idaho; in any case we find that two religious of the Holy Names came thither from Portland, Ore., in August of 1867, escorted by Father Malo, for the purpose of choosing a suitable location for an academy for young girls. They were gladly received and liberal donations were bestowed on them by Catholics and Protestants alike. The Sisters selected for their school a good lot in Idaho City. Though stirring appeals were made by the local press in behalf of this educational project, and several enthusiastic meetings of the citizens were held to promote it, the brunt of the labor of gathering the requisite funds was stood by our devoted pastor. This appeared necessary in view of the fact that Archbishop Blanchet had insisted that all the money needed for the school would have to be collected before beginning to build. The school was opened on January 13, 1868. The attendance may be inferred from the Idaho City school census of the previous fall, which quoted the average attendance of school children as being 104 girls between 4 and 14 years, and 85 boys between 4 and 16. There being no accommodation for boys in the Sisters' school, we may assume the number of 60 pupils under the care of the Sisters to be a fair estimate.

At this time a great change took place in the ecclesiastical affairs of Idaho. In accordance with a decision of the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore, the Holy See had been asked to make the Territory of Idaho a Vicariate Apostolic, and Father Louis Lootens was recommended for the office of its chief pastor. Rome complied with the request, and on August 9th of that year he was consecrated Bishop of Castaballa and Vicar Apostolic of Idaho. The ceremony took place at San Francisco at the hands of the Most Reverend Joseph Sadoc Alemany, assisted by Bishops Connor and Mora. The new prelate had, as will be remembered, come as a missionary to Vancouver in 1852. There he endeared himself to the miners of Cariboo and the Fraser River. He had also visited regularly the aborigines scattered along the east coast of the island, travelling mostly in Indian canoes and frequently

at the imminent peril of his life. After spending about nine years in Vancouver Island, Father Lootens had gone to California, laboring first at St. Patrick's Church, Sonora; later in charge of St. Vincent's Church, Petaluna, and St. Rafael's, Marin County. Here he had labored with great zeal, erecting a beautiful church and an orphanage, and enlarging the academy buildings at a cost of $5,000.

Bishop Lootens came to Idaho in the beginning of 1869, accompanied by Father A. J. A. Archambault. Fathers Mesplié and Poulin were the only two secular priests to be found at that time in the Territory, which was blessed with but four rather small churches, the Capital being still without one.

The Bishop selected as his headquarters Granite Creek, a mere village or what was known as a placer-mining camp; but its very air was fragrant with genuine Catholic devotion. Even to this day the deep and intelligent piety of the people there has been remarked and has won the heart of every priest whose good fortune it was to minister to them. No wonder Bishop Lootens loved that quiet, isolated spot of his extensive Vicariate. While in Idaho, he was during most of the time engaged in missionary work, living as the poorest among his flock in one or two little rooms annexed to the church, and boarding with a good Catholic woman, a Mrs. J. O'Leary. Should any one who knew this prelate be asked which was his most remarkable virtue, the ready answer would be, "His love for children." He was perfectly happy when surrounded by a crowd of Indian or white children. There is in the neighborhood of Granite Creek a hillock, called to this day the Bishop's Hill, because he was wont to take the little children of the parish thither once a week. After saying the Rosary and singing hymns there, they indulged in different games. If we lacked other proofs of his simple virtue, his attachment to the lambs of his flock would furnish us a sure index of his humble priestly character. He was equally fond of the poor. Cardinal Manning in his *Eternal Priesthood* (Chapter IX) observes that "if priests love the poor, they need not doubt whether their lot is that of Judas or of the Beloved Disciple, for Judas cared not for the poor." The priest who owns this twofold love —of the poor and of children—and who in turn is beloved by

the lowly and the little ones, is sure to be a man after the heart of God, without the pride and harshness which instinctively repel. As the Bishop was ever mindful of his sacred character, the filial affection he fostered in his flock won him from all the greater respect. It may be said that the hearts of his diocesans knelt in reverent love at the benediction of his passing among them. Unfortunately his stay was short.

In October of the same year, 1869, after visiting Portland, Oregon, and officiating there, he left for Rome to attend the Vatican Council. He must have gone with a heavy heart. In the early summer the church of Granite Creek, his favorite abode, his very home, was destroyed by an accidental fire, which had started in a neighbor's house. And, had he been aware of it, he would no doubt have grieved that his parishioners, who had scarcely recovered from the sacrifices made in erecting that chapel and in helping to put up at Idaho City the $7,000 Sisters' school, deemed it necessary in their eagerness to recover their loss to resort to the allurement of a ball at which tickets sold at $6 each, to be devoted to a new house of worship. We should say, however, that the adopted method, which might seem questionable to us, became somewhat excusable owing to the fact that the number of wage-earners had greatly diminished at the time; for, owing to some unlooked-for local mishaps, and to new excitements in other districts, there had been a large exodus of miners from Boise Basin; so much so that the Sisters, seeing their support almost wholly cut off, were constrained, in June of 1869, to close their academy indefinitely, and to return to Portland.

In the course of the previous February, the Bishop, probably foreseeing this collapse, had striven hard to locate the nuns in Boise; but, owing to his depleted treasury and to his inability to refill it, his efforts proved vain.

During the absence of the Bishop in 1870 the first Catholic church in Boise was built by Fathers Mesplié and Poulin on a block donated by John A. O'Farrell. They were greatly aided by Colonel A. St. Clair, commander of the Fort Boise soldiers. The new edifice had been dedicated on Christmas eve, and was only partly paid for when, on January 12th, it was burnt to the

ground. The site had to be mortgaged and later on became the property of some laymen.[1]

During all this time the Catholic population had decreased considerably; large numbers of miners had left the region; the Sisters had closed their school and were gone; the two finest churches had been burnt to the ground; and when the new chapel was to be put up at Boise, the small missions were burdened with debt. Under the circumstances it was but natural that Father Mesplié sought a new way to secure help for his needy people.

For nearly a quarter of a century he had attended a dozen military posts without receiving any compensation from the United States. He had deserved exceedingly well of his adopted country, particularly during the Indian wars. Therefore, most likely at the suggestions of Colonel St. Clair and of other military friends, our modest priest, a lover of peace and not of arms, sought for the position of U. S. A. Chaplain, which would secure him a steady maintenance and would allow him to serve not only the soldiers, but also the stray sheep in the surrounding districts. No one could have presented better credentials, as was known to many officers in the army. Accordingly our missionary sought the mediation of General Sheridan. The following original letter will explain itself:

HEADQUARTERS, MILITARY DIVISION OF THE MISSOURI.
Chicago, Ill., March 31, 1870.

REV. FATHER TOUSSAINT MESPLIÉ, R. C. PRIEST,
Boise City, Idaho Territory.

Rev. and dear Sir:—General Sheridan directs me to say in reply to your letter of the 13th inst., that he remembers with great pleasure his former acquaintance with you while serving on the Pacific coast; and it will afford him much satisfaction if, in any way, he can assist you to the appointment you desire.

Under existing laws, chaplains are appointed only for colored regiments. No other regiments are entitled to them, but there are

[1] About thirteen years later, however, it was purchased by the Sisters of the Holy Cross, who erected a hospital on it in 1894. Father Mesplié's old residence on the adjacent block (likewise lost to the parish) has been for years a portion—and until five years ago the chief portion—of St. Teresa's Academy, first established by the same Sisters in 1889.

thirty post chaplains allowed for the Army. The Army Register for 1869 only shows twenty-five in service. I think that, owing to the recent consolidation in the infantry regiments, there are two surplus chaplains, thus twenty-seven altogether, leaving three vacancies to be filled, if the President so direct.

General Sheridan thinks that you had better make application to the Secretary of War for an appointment as Post Chaplain in the Army. Enclose in the application proof that you are a regularly ordained Catholic priest in good standing, and obtain the endorsement of all the officers of the Twenty-third whom you know are willing to recommend your appointment. Then send the papers to him (General Sheridan), and he will forward them to the War Department strongly recommended, and will do all in his power to secure you the position.

I am, dear Sir, with great respect,

Your obedient servant,

GEORGE A. FORSYTH, BAT. BRIG. GEN., U. S. A.,

Military Secretary.

Meanwhile our zealous missionary was not unmindful of his beloved Indians. During the first years of his sojourn in the Basin, he visited, alternately with Father Poulin, the Bannocks, Shoshones, and Snakes of Southern Idaho. In a letter to General Parker, Commissioner of Indian Affairs, dated February 13, 1871, he says that there are four hundred and fifty Catholic Indians at the Fort Hall Reservation, which had just then been established, and he asked that the agent be instructed to allow him and Father Poulin full liberty to instruct these Indians, since they were well disposed toward the Black Robes. It was with a view to further this same cause that he went East, returning later on to Idaho City with Bishop Lootens, whom he met in Kansas. After this he made the rounds of his mission twice, and rode to Fort Hall, reaching the Red men on August 8th, after twelve days of hard travelling through the sands. From Fort Hall he wrote to Father De Smet at St. Louis, communicating to him his intention of making his headquarters at that Reservation, since Captain M. P. Berry, the newly appointed agent, was in hearty sympathy with his work for the Indians.

On September 21, 1871, Bishop A. M. A. Blanchet, writing from Vancouver, Washington, congratulated our missioner on his success with the Indians :—

"You had a hard fight to secure that agency. May you be left in possession of it, despite eventual opposition of our foes. As to ourselves, so far we have battled in vain. There is little hope of obtaining justice, whether for the mission of Sincoe or that of Puget Sound. Methodist influence is too strong with the President to let him carry out the new policy. How weak the Government shows itself with regard to everything pertaining to Catholics! The land-sections to which we are entitled are not granted us. The decision as to our rights is put off ten, twelve, and fifteen years, to the great harm of our missions. Yet late newspapers have published that the matter of the Vancouver section (in appeal) and that of St. Rose would soon be decided by the Secretary of the Interior. All we can do is to endeavor to hasten a decision. Do what you can, if you go to Washington."

Probably Bishop Lootens knew of Father Mesplié's application for a U. S. A. chaplaincy; at all events he gave him the following recommendation under date of January 4, 1872, written in Latin, which I translate:—

To all who may see this letter we make known and attest that the bearer thereof, the Rev. T. Mesplié, a priest of this Vicariate Apostolic, obtained our leave to go to Washington, in order to confer with the Government over certain matters bearing upon the future conversion of the Indians. We beseech whomsoever he may call upon to receive him kindly and charitably.

(Signed) LOUIS LOOTENS,
Vicar Apostolic of Idaho.

If Father Mesplié knew of the efforts being made by those who were interested in the progress of the Church in America to have him advanced to the Episcopate, he might have been tempted to believe in his superior virtue and to plead his own cause while on his journey in the East. The following letter will explain itself.

SAN FRANCISCO, February 14, 1872.

MESSRS. D. J. TWOHY, J. M. JOHNSTON, and others:—

I will keep in mind your petition to have Father Mesplié recommended for the office of Vicar Apostolic, or Bishop of Utah.

JOSEPH S. ALEMANY, A.S.F.

That the well-known Idaho priest was in Washington at this time we gather from the following note of General Sherman's wife:—

Dear Father Mesplié:

Since I returned home, I have been very much indisposed, else I would have come to see you. My daughter called to see you to-day with a message from me, but you were not in.

I am very anxious to aid you in your work, and hope I may be able to do so. I shall visit you to-morrow if I am better, as I hope to be. In the meantime, I am

Very truly and respectfully yours,

ELLEN EWING SHERMAN.

207 I STREET, April 20, 1872.

Matters of stirring interest were under discussion at this juncture, and Archbishop F. N. Blanchet writes to Father Mesplié as follows:

PORTLAND, ORE., May 1, 1872.

Reverend Missionary:—

Yours of the 6th and 7th ult. to hand, as also that of good Father Maguire, who gives up my agency without telling me who will take his place. Will it be Father Wiget, whose telegram I answered directly to the President? I sent to the Hon. Senator Cassidy Nos. 12 and 13 of the *Catholic Sentinel,* recommending the re-publication of No. 12's article entitled: "Execution of the five Cayuse Indians in 1850, with Reminiscences of Early Days." No. 13 contains my three letters with the five Indians' statement before their death. It is important that Catholic papers reproduce those pieces. This comes opportunely after "*Several Calumnies Refuted.*" These documents contain new proofs against Spalding, in the conversion (to the Catholic Church) of those sentenced and in the declaration they made before dying that the priest never instigated the Indians to murder Whitman. See that this be published for the instruction of our Senators who were so eager to issue Spalding's infamous pamphlet.[2] Inquire whether Father

[2] *Executive Document No. 37,* XLI Congress, III Session, furnished by Mr. Delano, Secretary of the Interior (Senate Resolutions, February 2, 1871), composed exclusively of information supplied by the Rev. H. H. Spalding to A. B. Meacham, Superintendent of Indian Affairs.

For a refutation of this list of deliberate and most atrocious slanders see "Several Calumnies Refuted," or Executive Document No. 37. Reprinted from the

Wiget can be our agent, and whether our convert-lawyer will find in Washington the documents of The Dalles, relative to the indemnities of the damage done by the soldiers. If not, I will send them from here. I forward to the Hon. Delano a long letter which closes thus: "I beg and entreat you to save me more trouble. Give us Klamath Reservation, because we have your word for it; give us Fort Hall Reservation, because it is ours by the best titles; efface the disagreeable impression the non-fulfilment of your promise has produced in my mind; and let your honorable name pass unstained to just appreciating posterity."

Your servant,

† F. N. BLANCHET,

Abp. of O. C.

Again, on May 4, 1872, the Archbishop wrote to Father Mesplié:

I charged Father Wiget to go to Washington in order to prevent misrepresentation, and explain to the President the proofs of our rights to Fort Hall Reservation. I sent the President a copy of my letter to Mr. Delano.

With regard to these reservations take no action without consulting Father Wiget or Father Maguire, so as to avoid imprudent or false measures. As to The Dalles' mission damage, estimated at $4,000, you will find either a priest or a trusty layman willing to act as my agent in pushing the claims and procuring the money. Use Col. Traynor and the affidavit of A. M. A. Blanchet, Bp. of Nesqually, your own and five laymen's. The appraisement of $4,000 damage had been sent to Washington in 1855. I saw the document there in 1859 at the Military Department. Should that copy be lost, I have another one, well vouched for, taken from the original deposited at the County Clerk's office, Oregon City, which I can send you upon request. Further damages have been done after 1855 for perhaps more than another $4,000, but of these we have neither proofs nor appraisement. Father Mackin says that a farmer (I forget his name) whose

Catholic World, February, 1872, also "History vs. The Whitman Saved Oregon Story," by Wm. I. Marshall, Principal of the W. E. Gladstone School, Chicago, Member American Historical Association. (Paper 25 cents.) The latter characterizes the (Rev. H. H.) Spalding-Gray story of the Whitman massacre having been instigated by the Hudson Bay Company and the Catholics "*as atrocious and as inexcusable a slander as ever was uttered.*"

land is situated along the Little Mill River obtained an indemnity of $7,500 for similar damages. Col. Traynor must know this.

You spoke of publishing in a pamphlet all the letters bearing on that question; but where can you find them all? Some are at the Indian Bureau. I am anxious to know the result of my telegram to the President. As to the messages to the Hon. Delano, which Father Maguire asked me to send at your solicitation, what has been their result? As I expected, they angered the Secretary; and he refused everything.

I see the necessity of an agent in Washington for the Indian affairs in general. I hoped Father De Smet would be the man, but he declined. Where can we find one to take his place?

Next Father Mesplié received from the Archbishop's brother the following letter:

Dear Sir:—

In answer to your letters and dispatch I advise you to find out (while awaiting the effect which "A Catholic's Appreciation of the Decision" will produce), whether the obliging (?) party would accept land instead of money; and the amount he would ask. If we have to buy justice, it is easier to give land than money. The party could derive a great benefit from it; and the mission would be rid of the inevitable trouble to get pay from the citizens. Before paying aught, however, I am determined to use all imaginable honest means; *e.g.*, an appeal to the President or to the Administration; then, if necessary, an appeal to Catholic and other fair and enlightened citizens, of whom there are millions in the United States.

On the eve of the elections, this last measure would, in my opinion, prove efficient. The fear of losing millions of votes would, I presume, cause the *auri sacram famem* by which the Government is so horribly tormented.

You will doubtless communicate this to the Rev. Father Wiget.

I am very cordially, Sir,
Your devoted servant,

AUG. M. A. BLANCHET,
Bp. of Nesqually.

Shortly afterwards the Archbishop writes:—

PORTLAND, ORE., June 29, 1872.

Monsieur le Missionnaire :—

No official news as yet about Fort Hall Reservation. The papers published it; but to what extent may we believe them? As soon as I know it for sure, I will write to the President and to Secretary Delano; but how are we to express gratitude for incomplete favors and such expensive ones? For what has become of Klamath? How sad? What face do the Methodists put on anent Fort Hall? I am anxious to get news on these various points, and especially on the matter of my letter of the 23d inst.—whether it is true, to your knowledge, that the Vicariate Apostolic of Idaho is not able to support a bishop, that a bishop is out of place there; and that the population has decreased; that the mines are exhausted, etc.

Your very humble servant in Christ,

F. N. BLANCHET,

Abp. of O. C.

Rev. Father Mesplié,

Care of the Rev. Wiget, S.J., Washington.

While taking so much pains about the Indians, our energetic missioner did not desist from pushing his own claims; for on August 17, 1872, he obtained the desired appointment of United States Post Chaplain. In the following October he was assigned to Fort Boise, and instructed to repair thither at his own expense, according to law.

He undoubtedly rejoiced over his good fortune. Not so his former superior, who, probably not understanding Father Mesplié's anxiety, penned him the following letter:

PORTLAND, ORE., September 3, 1872.

Rev. Father Mesplié :—

I was very much surprised upon reading in the *Irish Republican* that you had been appointed United States Army Chaplain.

I brought you from France in 1847; I ordained you priest; I employed you and know you, and I declare that you are too easy-going to be competent for that office. Don't fail then to decline it at once. The Government is tired of your praiseworthy importunities relative to the Indian missions. It has amused

and fooled you, playing fast and loose, promising, giving, and taking away. And now by an empty title it seeks to shut your mouth concerning the Indians, and thereby purchase the votes of Catholics by a seeming liberal-mindedness, to redeem itself and cover up the odious iniquity of having robbed the Bishop of Nesqually of the St. James' claim, giving him only 144 square feet. The Government also wants to clear itself of having promised, given us, and taken away our Indian reservations. Don't be so simple as to let yourself be caught in this trap. To save our Indians, that is our glory and our title. Say boldly: "Thank you very much, gentlemen, for your gifts. I don't want them. Give them to others. What brought me here is the interests of our Catholic Indians. That is what I ask. If you don't . . . we shall see." The object of our rulers is to buy you. Scorn their offers. Remember the contempt shown the Bishops, the clergy, and eight million Catholics in the selection of the Board of Indian Commissioners. Remember the Board's, the President's, and the Secretary's behavior, the injustice done the Bishop of Nesqually and the numerous Bishops of Indian missions given over to Protestant agents. Come on; now is the time to show yourself firm and to prove that they are mistaken in believing that you will let yourself be taken in by an empty title. Believe me. That is what you have to do. Woe to you if you don't. We shall lose our missions, and you will lose your soul without gaining one soldier. Catholic soldiers will always find priests; not so our poor Indians. Show that you are not a child. Cover yourself with glory by refusing that vain title.

Tell me as soon as possible what you are going to do. Pout,—what? Your Bishop has but to command, and all is settled.

Yours devotedly,

F. N. BLANCHET, *Abp. of O. C.*

How interesting would it be to read the Reverend appointee's reply to the good prelate's eloquent effusion. But we have, for the most part, only the letters received by Father Mesplié, not those which he wrote. Before he had answered, the Archbishop wrote again:

PORTLAND, ORE., September 9, 1872.

Rev. Father Mesplié:—

The Superintendent of the Indians in Oregon has established a new agency among the Snakes. These Indians had never been visited

by the Methodists. Father Poulin must have visited them in 1863. Preacher Parish may say of them, what he owned of those of Fort Hall, that they belong to us. You were in those places. You must know it. It is your duty, then, to plead our cause, and to vindicate our rights in this new reservation, without compromising or yielding our rights to Fort Hall and Klamath.

Fort Hall had been restored to you, and now it has been given to others. Thus they dupe you. They go still further. They shut your mouth by a vain title to get the souls of our Indians. *Sanguinem eorum de manu tua requiram.* Destroy the Methodists' pretensions to that reservation.

F. N. BLANCHET.

How eagerly were papers looked for in those days of slow transcontinental transportation is evident from the words which the Archbishop adds to his letter: "The *Irish American* of the 31st has not come yet."

Father Mesplié certainly worked hard in the Capital. Witness the following note to him from the Bishop of Nesqually:

VANCOUVER, November 18, 1872.

Dear Father:—

Your interesting letters of October 26th and November 2d at hand. I thank you very much for the interest you take in our affairs at Washington. I received also your most important communication of Mr. O'Brien. I will write him.

After mature consideration, Monsignor the Archbishop and I decided to send Father Brouillet to Washington. I conveyed our purpose to him, and I am awaiting his answer. If he accept our commission, as I hope, he will leave shortly. I am pleased to learn that the Rev. Father Deshon is also working for us; his past, as well as his present position must give weight to his intervention. Please thank him in my name for having gone to the president at Long Branch with you. I am cordially, Reverend Sir,

Your devoted servant,

AUG. M. A. BLANCHET, *Bp. of Nesq.*

Again he writes to the same:—

VANCOUVER, November 21, 1872.

Reverend Sir:—

I have just received your letter of the 8th inst. I am pleased that you protested upon Mr. O'Brien's advice, and that Mr. Stock has been preparing an argument.

I am minded to employ Mr. O'Brien to defend our pendant cases. Upon arriving in Washington, Father Brouillet will make arrangements with him, without however excluding Mr. Morris, "a distinguished lawyer, a good Catholic who wants no pay;" who, as Father Wiget says, has offered his services. Those Catholic jurists, so highly recommended, naturally inspire us with confidence. General Chipman, a Congressman who offered to present my letter to the President, was willing to do his part in Congress. I presume he is the gentleman who helped Mr. O'Brien in his researches in the divers departments.

Messrs. Farrar and Landers have nothing to do with the pendant cases. It may be well to let them know this. Mr. Gray wrote the City Council that a Jesuit had put in a protest, etc.

Cordially, Your devoted servant,

A. M. A. BLANCHET, *Bp. of Nesq.*

CYRIL VAN DER DONCKT.

Pocatello, Idaho.

(*To be continued.*)

HOBBIES FOR ECCLESIASTICS.

IN the course of conversation with an old and valued friend we touched upon the subject of the education given to-day in our Seminaries. The talk began to run upon the old still existing fallacy that Instruction is Education; and that the receptivity of a certain amount of ill-digested and ill-assimilated information served out in manuals is a moral educator. "Putting in" is one thing; "educating" is another. The personal influence of a wise, strong, and formed man upon the undeveloped character of the young seems to be left out of calculation altogether in our schools and colleges. We do not aim, so it seems, at the formation of character as did those great men, Arnold of Rugby, and Thring of Uppingham. Latin and Greek, Mathematics and History were left to the class-masters; but the character-building was a work

sacred to the head-master. I was reminded of this by a case which had lately come under my notice. A youth of fifteen years, who had been for six years at a college, was lately dismissed. No moral charge against him. His abilities were acknowledged; but, term after term, complaint was made of a want of application. Now, it seems to me that anyone who, undertaking not only to teach but *educate*, fails in six years to train a boy how to apply his mind, and how to use his faculties, stands confessed a failure as an educationalist. The boy, as I saw him, was at fifteen as much of a child in ideas and behavior as he was at nine years, although he had learnt a good deal, wrote a good hand, was given to literature and had a pretty taste in geology. I know it is a general idea in Catholic schools that our boys have a great advantage over non-Catholics by the use of the Sacraments; and that our moral training goes on in the Confessional. So it should; but does it? A priest in the sacred tribunal is *pater*, *medicus*, and *judex;* whether he is also an educator of moral character, except in a very general sort of way, is a question which experience can solve. There seems to be some kind of subtle Pelagianism lurking in us at times. And I don't forget that Pelagius, *alias* Morgan, was a Breton.

Education is sacrificed to instruction, and the "Law of Cram" rules everything. As it is in the lay school, so it seems from all appearance of average results to be the case in our Seminaries. We know on one hand what the Catholic system is capable of; and on the other we see it at work. Mediocrity and shallowness; brilliancy of a sort, but no solidity; imposing schemes of studies combined with pretentiousness. In a word, "skimmed milk masquerading as cream." This adverse opinion is not common to us, but is shared by everyone who thinketh in heart, and compares the one thing with another.

Our Seminaries unquestionably send out men who are zealous, holy, patient, long-suffering, and in many cases of high spiritual tone. But is this enough to do the Master's work? "There are 50,000 churchmen in this country," says a well-known French writer, "but the nation has slipped between their hands. Whence comes that incompetency? From the Seminary training." Another great Frenchmen writes: "After thirty years of education

you have not given a single defender to the Church; and our opponents have mainly been trained by you."

What is the cause? It seems to me that the individual has been neglected. He is only a part of a machine. Militarism has seized hold of the Church. How far this has been can be seen from the proud boast of Cardinal Bonnechose in the *Sénat* (March, 1865). "Mon clergé est un régiment: il doit marcher, et il marche." As far as I can see, the result of all this marching has been a rout.

Because it seems to me that in our Seminaries the individual is largely sacrificed to the community interest, I venture to set down some thoughts on the subject of *Hobbies* as a great help toward self-education and developing the personality of the priest. There are, when one comes to think of it, fewer things of greater importance to a priest. And for the reason that I shall give. A priest has to depend upon his own resources of mind much more than has a layman. We lead, even in the midst of bustling cities, a preëminently solitary life. The companionship and intimacy of family life we give up; so for us are not those cares and joys in which the layman finds a change of thought and a distraction when he comes home from his day's work. Those with whom we live are generally none of our seeking. We have to put up with them; and they with us. Perhaps of different race, temperament, views, tastes, and manners, with some, companionship, in the real sense of the word, is neither possible nor perhaps desirable. When the day's work is over, we find ourselves at home, and thrown back upon that same individuality which has kept us company all the clock round. Yet human nature needs a change; we cannot always keep at high pressure. *Dulce est desipere in loco.* For the priest this must be, as a rule, by himself. He must recreate himself alone, even as he lives alone. This is the reason why, I think, the pursuit of some hobby as a means of lawful recreation is of prime necessity for a priest; and yet, as far as my experience goes, a priest with a hobby is rather the exception than the rule. Those who have cultivated hobbies, have often done so in spite of adverse circumstances which surrounded their youth. The strong minds have asserted themselves, and the weak ones have not been strengthened and helped.

Let us look at the hobby a little more closely. The first requirement is that it must be intellectual, *i.e.*, such as, while bringing a real change to the mind, will, at the same time, serve to develop it. It is in this way that the hobby is distinct from mere manual labor. Sawing wood can hardly arrive at the dignity of a hobby; but carving can. Painting a door is not particularly intellectual work, but illuminating, decorating, or picture-painting is of a higher order, and calls more of the intellectual faculties into play than the mere mechanical occupation. Manual labor (which has its use, too, as exercise) *per se* leaves vacant the mind, which the hobby cultivates. Some occupations partake, or can be made to partake, of both. Cultivation of flowers and plants provides exercise and fresh air, increases our knowledge of nature, and demands a high degree of skill to bring about satisfactory results.

Another requirement of the hobby is that it must be inexpensive. Not many of us are able to work in the precious metals, or to collect and to study rare china, lace, gems, or coins. But wood-work requires very little outlay; bookbinding also can be raised to a very perfect art; while painting, illumination, designing, architecture, archæology, botany, geology, music in its theory and practice, chemistry, electricity, the microscope, astronomy,—these and many other pursuits can be very precious helps in the time of weariness and faint-heartedness,—without any undue call upon the purse. I know a priest who, during a time when reading and writing were forbidden by the doctor, found the greatest comfort in needle-work. True, he almost exhausted the patience of friends by gifts of Berlin-wool worked slippers. But, then, having acquired some dexterity with his needle, he began silk embroidery and worked stoles and various church vestments and helped to adorn that Altar which had rejoiced his youth. I may mention in passing that most of the church embroidery for which Bruges is so justly celebrated is the work of men. St. Dunstan excelled in embroidery as he did in music and metal work. It surely would be appropriate for a priest to use his skill in working robes of cunning device, rare coloring, and rich materials for the service of the sanctuary. In olden days the *opus anglicanum* was greatly valued on the Continent of Europe, and to this day specimens can be found jealously guarded in some sacristies abroad.

Again, I have known priests who carved the altars and stalls of their churches, or decorated in frescoes the walls, making them veritable lessons from the Gospels to their people. Need I say anything about social and civic work as a hobby which affords relief after other professional duties? There must be some reasonable mean between our duties and the pipe, newspaper or magazine.

We must now turn to the hobby of study or the intellectual growth of the mind. This hobby has many branches, and appeals to every cultivated taste. But here we are met by an initial difficulty. Taken as a body, we are not students, in fact most of us have probably *never been taught how to study.* This, the real function of a seminary or college, has been overlooked altogether. We are crammed with a certain amount of book-learning extracted from manuals and *compendia;* and success in examinations is gauged more by our power of receiving this spoon-meat than by any real assimilation of thought or of knowledge of things as they are in themselves. Bacon says, "Distilled books are like common distilled waters, flashy things." *Abeunt studia in mores.* On the other hand, education must, I know, in a large measure, be self-worked. Professors there are in number who can cram pupils; but how many can make them think? The real work of education is set aside, and instruction, which only needs receptivity, is substituted. The result is that the average man leaves his seminary pious but commonplace. He has been neither taught how to learn nor how to think. I am aware that this fact may accidentally be a blessing to the individual, since it may develop originality and particular energies later on. But ordinarily that does not happen. The seminary system is of course perfectly capable of development along the right lines. In many seminaries, especially in Germany, the education is real and the instruction is solid.

Is it not a duty that we owe to God and to the Church, each in his own case, to repair faulty training and to begin *now* to learn how to learn? As I said above, education is a work which depends largely upon oneself. It is a measure of self-discipline of the very highest efficacy. The very habit, painfully won, of concentration of thought, is a most valuable asset in the moral

struggle which is ever going on during the bloodless martyrdom of the priesthood. It helps us to be men of prayer and of the inner life. Solitude loses its terrors and becomes sweet and pleasant. The necessary concomitant of our life helps on our work. "Never less alone than when alone," I have been able to say for years. Days that pass with hardly a word spoken are often sweeter than those when companionship is at hand. To have a retired nook in one's heart is a priceless boon. *Odi profanum vulgus.* It is all my own; not even the best and dearest of friends can pass that threshold. This does not imply that a man must be misanthropic. On the contrary he may relish congenial society, and know the value, above gold and riches, of a friend. But friends, real and constant, are few for most of us; for friends must have tastes in common, mind must act upon mind; otherwise we are mere acquaintances, or like ships that pass in the dark.

Now what is the general attitude toward the intellectual hobby? I have said that we are met at the outset with an initial difficulty, the hard fact that there is but little intellectual life or, what is worse, any desire for such. I lately read in a work by a famous Italian ecclesiastic the following history, which bears out what I have said:

"About the end of August, I think it was in 1872, I was crossing one of the streets of Florence on my way to visit a sick person. It was three o'clock in the afternoon and the street was almost empty, for a burning sun shone down. I noticed a young priest, of a very pleasing appearance, standing in the middle of the street with his head uncovered and a bewildered look that made me think that he was ill. I went to him and asked him if he were suffering, and if I could do anything for him. He said, 'Nothing.' But to save him from that broiling sun I gently drew him into a bookseller's shop hard by and made him sit down. I then asked him what had happened and whether I could be of any service to him. He answered at last:

"'My bishop has just appointed me to a country parish.'

"'Well,' said I, 'that does not seem to be a matter to distress you. It means that you are at the beginning of your sacred ministry. Be of good heart and take courage.'

"'But,' said he, 'I have never been out of the seminary; I know

nothing of the world; I have never had to deal with women. How can I live all day long by myself alone in a house with only my housekeeper?'

"'Have you mentioned your anxieties to your superior?'

"'Yes,'' said the young man, 'but he will not listen to reason.'

"'Then,' said I, 'take heart and go in obedience; keep this holy fear and mistrust of yourself as your safeguard. Arrange your time well. Pray much; and above all give yourself to some kind of study, whatever you feel most disposed to, and you will soon feel that you have found the cherished companion of your life.'

"'Study?' said he. 'Oh, I have passed all my examinations. What is there left for me to study?'

The writer continues:

"My business with the sick man requiring haste, after a few more words of comfort I left the young priest. But with a saddened heart. It confirmed my opinion, the result of much experience, that our young priests, so far from forming a habit and a line of study in our present seminaries, do not even learn to form an idea of it. Now, without this defence, I repeat it, some there will indeed always be who by the grace of God keep themselves as becomes their holy calling; but the common sort will not, cannot, be other than what we see they are.''

Would Padre Curci have to change his opinion were he to-day amongst us? We have the same idea that, as examinations are over, we can put our books on the shelves. Considering what the books so often are, they are not worth that place ofhonor. The difficulty is not got over by a system of examinations for the Junior Clergy. These examinations, based on the same principle of cram, only intensify the malady. The cure lies in ourselves. We are what we make ourselves; and one of the best of the results of the hobby of study is that it, perforce, makes and keeps us humble. The really learned man is truly a humble man, for he realizes how very little he knows in fact. He gazes into the infinite ocean of truth. And shall he strut and prance and think himself a mighty "fine" fellow because he has gathered up a teaspoonful of the limitless fount? Real knowledge does not puff up a man; pseudo-knowledge does. Some one has said: "A real Liberal Catholic is one who knows his religion; a sham

Liberal Catholic is one who doesn't." It is this latter which is offensive to piety. Or, as it has been put: "It is the half-educated Catholic who is either the pseudo-liberal or the intolerant Catholic."

Now what a field lies before the priest who takes up an intellectual hobby! I will pass by natural sciences and secular literature, all perfectly legitimate and useful provinces of knowledge. I will say nothing of that deeply interesting side of art,—I mean the scientific. But I come to the more professional subjects concerning which a priest has already gained a certain knowledge. What about Patristic theology? How many of us have ever read one of the Fathers? How many have studied him in his time and setting? How many have traced his influence down the ages to the present day? St. Augustine, St. Jerome, St. Cyprian, to mention but three, or St. Gregory the Great, can be picked up second-hand, and cheaply, too. The Migne edition is useful for beginners. Read one of the Christian Fathers first as a whole, and then take him up again and analyze his work. Read always with pen in hand and note-book by your side; and do not be afraid of copying out passages that strike you. Follow up side issues. If you want to understand what the writer really had in his mind, find out to whom he was writing, and why and when. Dates lead us into all sorts of new quarters and give us the atmosphere which surrounded the writer. Then we must look to the effect of the writing; how it was understood, what it achieved. One small letter of St. Augustine or St. Jerome will open out many questions. But in all this, write, write, and rewrite. For this is the best means of securing knowledge. Let me remind you of Bacon's words: "Reading makes a full man, conference a ready man, and writing an exact man."

Akin to Patristic study take history. I do not mean those pitiful manuals, "distilled books," or such impossible and useless works to the real student as Alzog, Jungmann, Rohrbacher, or Hergenröther. The new science of history, as it is now accepted by the learned, is based upon the *document*. Here we have, as its name implies, the instrument that teaches. We may fail in our interpretation of the document. But that will be the fault of our

critical methods. Go to the document and see what it really tells; and do not read into it your own ideas or prejudices. By setting it back into the circumstances under which it originated, a great light is thrown upon phrases, — and even omissions become eloquent. All this is a land of criticism. There are useful books, such as that by Langlois and Seignobos, that will put the student in the way of the science, although he may not agree with all he reads in their pages. In studying history it is well to remember the axiom that first-hand evidence is purer than second or third; that the report of an eye-witness is to be preferred to that of hear-say; that a contemporary document is of more value than one drawn up centuries after; that an original life, say of a saint, by a contemporary, will be found much simpler than a later one in which the marvellous runs riot. *Crescat eundo.* Therefore for real knowledge get back as far as you can to the earliest and purest document.

Why not apply this historical method to theology and carry out into detail the method Newman sketches in his *Essay of Development?* Take, for instance, one of the Sacraments, and see what are really the historical aspects of the case. Put aside for the time being the prepossessions you have from the manuals, and trace up the history, marking down exactly what you have certain grounds for holding. Take Penance or Holy Orders, for example. Morinus in either of these two will be of great help, and will cause us to open our eyes with wonder, as the past unfolds itself.

Another subject, which comes home to me very much, is the history of the Church. Take up a section, say the thirteenth century, or the age of the Schisms, or the era of the Reformation. There is nothing so fascinating as the study of an era, with causes and effects: and there is nothing which better enables us to understand later problems.

Then akin to this is the science of liturgy. The driblets that are served out in microscopic doses to the average student in the seminaries are beneath contempt. Professors often know little more than the students. It is a fact that men are appointed as teachers of such branches who have no true knowledge of the science. Text-books are full of rubbish and fancies that have

absolutely no basis in facts. In liturgy, above all things, it is necessary to go to the document and to study it and bring criticism to bear upon it. Liturgy so studied gives the key to ritual. If we have ritual without liturgy we have a kind of Chinese copy, without life and meaning. How an accurate knowledge of liturgy reacts upon theology I need not point out, nor its widening and deepening effect on the spiritual life.

Without pretending here to suggest lists of books on various subjects of the clerical hobby, I would say that a priest in the country will find in the catalogue of the public libraries abundant matter for his studies. There are some libraries where the subscribers can have boxes of books on loan and can keep them for a long time.

Should not, we, however, do something to help ourselves? A diocesan library of the more expensive books would be a great boon to the clergy. Regulations as to subscriptions and lending are mere matters of detail. Then reading clubs and reading circles with a prescribed *curriculum*, together with a quarterly meeting for debate on papers, would keep up the spirit. Archæological excursions, with papers read, are also means of stimulating interest in local knowledge. Why cannot two or three priests of kindred tastes form themselves into an informal society for mutual help and encouragement in some particular branch of study? I remember such an attempt was made in the diocese of Utopia; but the first meeting never came off; as the organizer was supposed to be *persona ingratissima*, and those he invited were afraid to come out even at night "for fear of the Jews." In such matters I do not believe in sitting down sighing until Authority says: "Get up and do." Initiative belongs to us, and if we are to do any real work, we must first see the necessity thereof and then do it. Do you remember Cardinal Manning's saying, "*Use legs and have legs.*" I take it, he meant: Set to work and do a thing for yourself, and then you will find through use that you have within you a power that you had never suspected.

I met some time ago a young priest in one of our great public libraries, and I asked him why he was there; he simply replied: "Because I am ignorant and want to know." If there were more like that brave young man, there would be a better lookout for the Church. Like priests, like people.

But ah! Smugness is a badge of the tribe, and who is free? The gospel of thoroughness is wanted. It is so easy to preach, and so hard to practise. A certain sage remarked: "It is noble to be good. It is nobler to teach others to be good—and less trouble." I do not venture to estimate the morality of the saying, but I will say that if I advocate the hobby, it is because I have found in its cultivation a stay in many a dark hour and a remedy in many afflictions. I feel so strongly the necessity of the hobby that, were I a bishop, I would see that time and opportunity were provided at the seminary for its cultivation, even if the clerics had to forego some of the less useful trimmings of an ecclesiastical education. Superiors of seminaries seem to have the responsibility of studying the individual under their care. The policy of forming a type of men at the expense of the individuality that God has given them to be cultivated, seems to be an unwarrantable interference with Providence, who deals with us each singly and not in battalions. So it is because the hobby is the assertion of individuality and its safeguard that I set forward before my brethren this plea for its cultivation.

ETHELRED L. TAUNTON.

Rome, Italy.

THE OLD APOLOGETIC.

THE science of Christian apologetic is receiving probably more attention to-day than any other department of Christian theology. Those who have studied most carefully the attitude of modern thought toward the ancient faith and the motives which underlie its disposition of reluctance either to affirm or to deny the evidences of Christianity, have for the most part thought that, while the traditional system has not lost and can lose none of its force or efficiency, there may be a danger lest our apologists by yielding to the spirit of the age and abandoning the old system of demonstration may be led eventually to substitute mere credible hypothesis for the older and approved moral certainty.

Yet the credible-hypothesis defence of religion is not new, but has always been recognized as of great value in establishing the claims of Christianity. It was fully understood and developed

before the Cartesian doubt ever assailed the old and impregnable foundations of philosophy. It is valuable in disarming opposition and dispelling ignorance and prejudice, but, as its advocates frankly confess, it can go no further than to prove the fact of Revelation to be credible; it cannot force the admission that it is indubitably true, and hence fails to furnish an adequate preamble of faith.

It seems a great mistake in philosophy to suppose that suspension of judgment can ever produce stable equilibrium in thought. The mind cannot rest upon any object less certain than a fact. In order therefore to satisfy reason we must have a system of philosophy based on reality, one in which objective reality determines certitude; otherwise the validity of all the external proofs of Revelation may be questioned. There is no doubt that the fact of Revelation can be demonstrated by reason,—"*cum recta ratio fidei fundamenta demonstret*";[1] "*ut recta ratio fidei veritatem demonstret, tueatur, defendat.*"[2]

Our greatest and, I may say, only advantage in apologetic over our opponents is that we have a solid, immovable foundation in philosophy and theology, whereas they have only changeable theories. Moral certainty in its own order compels assent. The faculty of reason may be and often is distorted, either unconsciously or wilfully, for men are always free to dissent from every conceivable truth, but they can no more escape the responsibility and consequences of their assent or denial than they can undo existence itself. Our real power of carrying conviction to the minds of others consequently depends more upon the certainty of what we affirm than upon anything else.

Certainty is furthermore necessary for moral obligation, and is essential to natural theology. Without rational certitude there could be no natural law binding in conscience; yet while admitting fully this essential distinction between the assent of reason and faith, we must also avoid the error of supposing that they can be exercised independently, or that one can be enhanced to the loss of the other. Leo XIII implies this in treating of the relation of the natural to the supernatural virtues in his Encyclical

[1] Concilium Vaticanum, Caput IV.
[2] Encyclica, Pii IX, Nov. 9, 1846.

on "Americanism." Hence the impossibility of contradicting by reason what we assent to by faith becomes manifest. For instance, the certainty of rational assent to the historical proofs of the Virgin-Birth, the Resurrection, and the Ascension of our Lord is necessarily involved in the acceptance of divine facts as these articles of faith.

The real issue that we have to meet may be reduced to a conflict between self-evident truths and rationalistic doubt. We know where we stand; whilst rationalists are dodging for a foothold amid quicksands. What, then, is the essential attitude of the Church in this crisis? Is she filled with fear and alarm lest she may be shorn of her past prestige by a new system of thought which will supersede her sovereign claim to be heard and obeyed by all mankind? Certainly the present state of apologetic science does not suggest such an attitude on her part, but rather indicates that she has entered upon a new era of aggressiveness in maintaining every jot and tittle of her ancient supremacy. The scholastic philosophy, which for nearly three hundred years had been ignored by some of her greatest apologists, has in less than forty years been restored to its former high position in her seats of learning. And as a consequence new generations of priests are everywhere combating rationalism with irresistible power, and are surely winning back men of right reason and good will to the unchangeable standard of truth; whereas the chief opponents of Catholicism in our midst are, as a rule, no longer the deep thinking and pure-minded men of our time, but very often indifferent, superficial, half-educated minds who value opinions only for their present popularity.

Now while the fact of Revelation is demonstrable to reason in the abstract, the concrete reason is so often hampered by temperament, prejudice, worldly interest, and passion, that it becomes inoperative. Logic, then, does not really prove; evidence does not convince. This is undeniably the mental state of vast numbers who, in our day, have laboriously unlearned the very axioms of philosophy.

What is the best remedy for this grievous condition? Must the will be counted on to determine an assent beyond the power of the evidence to enforce? Would not this supposition make

apologetic unscientific from the very start? In other words, by the substitution of mere credible hypothesis for indubitable proof we are, I think, liable to confirm our opponents in the opinion that faith cannot be supported by rational proofs. Inquirers after truth are always on guard and intently watching for some loophole of escape from the authority of faith.

To avoid any possible misunderstanding as to the real distinction between credible hypothesis and moral certainty and the relation of rational evidence to faith, I desire to define, as clearly as possible, my meaning. "Evidence proves with certainty that God has spoken through man, and it can lead the mind from the human instrument to the Divine Author; but it can never produce Divine faith, or take the place of faith in the heart of man."[3] I am simply upholding the following declaration promulgated by Gregory XVI on September 8, 1840: "*Ratio cum certitudine authenticitatem revelationis, Judaeis per Moysen et Christianis per Jesum Christum factae, probare valet.*" This proposition in no way refers to the supernatural certitude of faith which alone by its authority can rightly coerce the intellect in its proper function of ascertaining truth. Aside from the act of faith, the allegiance of the intellect is not to the will, but to the laws of evidence.

Again, it must be remembered that between credible hypothesis and moral certainty there is philosophically all the difference that there is between probability and certainty; and if we explicitly limit the preamble of faith to the former, we may, to say the least, seem to favor the following proposition condemned by Innocent XI on March 2, 1679: "*Assensus fidei supernaturalis et utilis ad salutem stat cum notitia solum probabili revelationis, imo cum formidine, qua quis formidet, ne non sit locutus Deus.*"

We can safely lead men to accept the faith only by inducing that allegiance to reason which God, its Author, has ordained. "*Rationis usus fidem praecedit et ad eam hominem ope revelationis et gratiae conducit.*"[4] The late Father Hecker, in his *Aspirations of Nature*, emphasizes nothing more strongly than this method. He

[3] *Christian Apology*, by Schanz. Chapter on "Reason and Revelation."

[4] V Prop. promulgated by Gregory XVI, September 8, 1840.

says: "Not a single step can be made in the advance toward truth without the open or tacit admission of the unerring authority (of reason)."

The unfaltering defence of unquestionable authority has always been, and always will be, the most persuasive moral force among men. Our age has not changed human nature; no age or outward circumstance of civilization can change it. Even when it persistently revolts against the twofold authority of reason and revelation, it only declares the majesty of the truth it defies. Yet we know that the apologist has to do more than present the rational demonstration of the fact of revelation; but what he has to do is precisely the opposite of admitting in word or act the feebleness of that demonstration; he must rather hold and declare more firmly its invincible power.

The external proofs of Revelation should not be given a secondary place, as if they were insufficient, because we find ourselves facing unconquered minds and wills not ready to command the acceptance of propositions which they have been taught to question.

The Divine polity demands acceptance of the external proofs of Revelation just as much as it does that of the truth revealed through it. By first convincing the reason we can ultimately reach the whole man,—his heart, his temperament, his affections, his religious nature. This is the method of the old apologetic, and is, I believe, as efficacious to-day as it ever has been in the past. By it I was led to the truth, and have ever since followed it in the practical warfare of apologetic as a missionary. It was once my privilege, while a Protestant, to hear one of Father Hecker's inimitable lectures. His subject was "The Religious Condition of our Country." From it I learned the never-to-be-forgotten lesson that Catholicism is indubitably true. In dealing with non-Catholics he abhorred the shadow of a compromise; if he could not convince a hearer of the inerrancy of reason and the infallibility of the Church, he considered his subject's conversion hopeless. If he had only endeavored on that occasion to present the fact of Revelation as a mere credible belief, I should, no doubt, have agreed with all he said, but I should not have become, as I thereupon did become, convinced of the sovereignty of the truth he spoke.

Christian apologetic has been essentially the same in every age, because the dogmas which it defends are unchangeable; on the other hand, the errors over which it has triumphed have been most diverse; and this fact, as history shows, has only developed its intrinsic strength and shown the corresponding weakness of its opponents. Its history is analogous to that of dogma, and establishes it as a positive science essentially bound up with the teaching of Christianity and the Church. During the martyr period it was just as authoritative and rational as when in the Patristic age it employed Greek philosophy so intelligently that the higher critics even attribute to large portions of it a Greek origin. But in truth this feature only witnesses to its triumph and the utter inadequacy of sophistry to combat it; the earliest apologists of this period had themselves been driven into the arms of Christianity by the failure of the highest heathen philosophy to satisfy the aspirations of their minds and hearts. Out of this contest there gradually arose a Christian school of philosophy which has lived on and increased until the present day, and far transcends in certitude and sublimity the whole pantheon of alien thought.

"*Demonstratio evangelica*" was but another name for "Christian apology" in the days of St. Athanasius, and *apologia* in those days meant precisely the opposite of what is now commonly understood by the English word "apology." It is a misfortune that we have not a better term to apply to this full-panoplied, age-tried mistress of thought.

While it is true that Christian philosophy attained the zenith of its influence in the scholastic period, it did not come to a standstill then. Its various contests with Humanism, Subjectivism, and Individualism have removed much of its useless subtlety, and strengthened its foundations, thus preparing the way for the Neo-Scholasticism so wisely recommended by Leo XIII in His Encyclical "*Aeterni Patris*" of August 4, 1879.

HENRY H. WYMAN, C.S.P.

San Francisco, Cal.

ROME'S WORK, AND RITUALISM.

THERE were once Ritualists like Dr. Littledale, who could publish *Plain Reasons against Joining the Church of Rome*, containing more *corrigenda* than, we believe, almost any other book of its size. Its mockery made some unbelievers, they tell us. When compared with its answer by Father Ryder of the Oratory, it helped to send Professor Windle and others on the road to Rome; for they looked up the references, and they compared quotations with the former misquotations. There are such Ritualists now, maybe. But let them pass. There are others, like our friend Mr. Spencer Jones, caring less about forms and ceremonies, and more about being united in charity to the Holy See. There are in the United States, the kindly "Franciscans," at Graymoor, and their little *Lamp*, which darts its beams much further than on those who quite can bear its light. And there is a fluttering through the Episcopalian dovecot, in the darkness made visible. Let us treat as doves those who have never a hard word for us, who send our wanderers to our own priests, who love St. Francis, and who pray that, as they say, their "prodigal Ecclesia Anglicana" may return to true unity under Pope Pius (whose picture has the place of honor where these his puzzled children dwell), and may make atonement for separating herself from "the Roman Pontiff, sitting in the Chair of Peter, the Vicar of Jesus Christ, and, by Divine right, the universal shepherd over the flock of Christ." There they are, as says one whose common sense and logic coöperated with grace, and led her into the fold, 'tis forty years since, by the Shepherd's own door, instead of spending that time among those who try to clamber over where Peter has only to knock them down. But there they are, "those truly holy souls, struggling so patiently and prayerfully to teach the whole Catholic truth to their Anglican brethren, and meeting with so much ridicule and misunderstanding from many Roman Catholics, as well as (and most of all) from their own. . . . Loving, tireless prayer, fervent and strong, will bring about our true reunion; bitterness, ridicule, rash judgment, and controversy never will. Their good faith in Anglican orders is firm and sincere."

And this we now recall, wishing to remind ourselves of how things really do stand with some who seem nearest to us, and yet are so far. And what follows is pure innocence. It has to do with one[1] who is not against us, and therefore is on our side, in these days when at the 1904 Birmingham Catholic Truth Society's Conference, under the Archbishop of Westminster, the chief paper was Father Gerard's on the rationalist popular propaganda, against which all Christians have a common cause, and when at the recent Washington Conference, under American Archbishops and Bishops, so much stress was laid on our own losses, and on the growth of unbelief, and of the materialistic world of socialism about us.

Let a Cardinal introduce the subject-cause of our reflections. "In the early part of 1880, Mr. Dolling came to visit me in Letterkenny, and stayed several days. In the summer of 1880, he and the Rev. A. Stanton of St. Alban's, Holborn" [a well-known London Ritualistic church], "paid me another visit, and I was deeply impressed with the charming character of Mr. Dolling. He was simple-minded, earnest, and entirely devoted to works of charity." And when Bishop Logue, as he then was, returned the visit, in London, there was this young Irishman, among those Evangelical ritualists, if we may say so, of St. Alban's, where the same devoted men served the poor and their "patrons," as serve them now, thirty years after. "He seemed to have a special tact for managing boys. He received very useful assistance from a number of ladies, some of whom I met; but he had a horror of ladies who patronized the boys." Here is one whose life will incite us to see where we can agree, rather than where we differ, who succeeded during a life of intense realism, strenuous, as the fashion is to say now, in bringing together Catholics and Protestants, high-born and low, rich and poor, English and Irish, "bad" and "good;" and that, not with any compromising, nor yet with dilettantism, nor contemplation of creeds—perhaps he was too little capable of such a thing—but by force of character, by enthusiasm, by love of men, by earnestness; by fighting, rather than by the piping ways of peace.

[1] *The Life of Father Dolling*, by C. E. Osborne. London: Edward Arnold.

And how did a Cardinal get to know him? "I first made the acquaintance of the late Rev. Robert R. Dolling when he was a young layman, toward the end of 1879. On July 20th, of that year, I was consecrated Bishop of Raphoe, and in the following autumn I found myself brought face to face with a very severe crisis. Owing to the very wet and cold summer, the crops were an almost complete failure; in consequence of which the people of Donegal were reduced to a condition bordering on starvation. Indeed, were it not for the aid received from the charitable public in England and America—especially America—what was merely a season of acute distress would have become a season of absolute famine. Mr. Dolling was among the earliest to come to my assistance, by forwarding sums which he had collected among his friends in London. His friend, the Rev. Mr. Russell, of St. Alban's, Holborn, also gave material assistance." So here was a young man, of good family, and some means, an Irish land-agent, himself of the landlord class, a Protestant, and educated in England, who had no other care than to look after poor fellows "whom I cherish with the deepest affection; who have kept the life in me, when Church dignitaries had all but turned my blood into vinegar and my heart into stone." And, as was said by another hearty English friend of his, "Mother Kate," whose Anglican sisterhood-life was reviewed so sympathetically in the Catholic DOLPHIN: "I shall never forget the welcome that awaited Brother Bob[2] at the landing-stage, from a crowd of clamorous warm-hearted Irish lads, who had heard he was coming, and all assembled to meet him. . . . It was a happy time" —this visit to Ireland—"and I came away with a pleasant memory of the bright sunshiny household, and of the wonderful power of this young man, who held, as it were, the souls of so many boys and lads in the hollow of his hand, to mould them for good." It is time for every one of us, surely, to give up (said speakers at this Washington Conference for our missions) the notion that Protestant missionaries are a sham—this greatest of all our injustices, thinks Mr. Starbuck, who yet so generously recognizes that, in misrepresentation of other men's beliefs, we happily are far behind.

[2] So they called him.

And it is also time for us all to be readily moved by the devotion of those whom we may not understand; and to have no *arrière-pensées*, whether we understand them or not. Coleridge says that an abuse of the sense of the ridiculous blinds the critic of literature. It blinds the critic of life. And so do the bitterness and contempt that one of our reviewers has shown to Cardinal Logue's charitable friend. He had Catholic young men about him in his laymen days. One such he introduced to the future Cardinal, that the latter might recall the wanderer to his duty. He regularly sent his Catholic protégés to their priests and to Mass. We read of our American Franciscans doing the same. I remember an Anglican clergyman advising the Protestant wife of a Scotch Catholic doctor to send for the priest for her husband, the clergyman's friend, who for many a year had not been to the Sacraments. They will not lose their reward. And the present writer, also, was brought up among Protestants in Ireland who habitually did something to keep all Catholics in touch with their priests. The subject of this memoir was yet more blessed, for he looked with complacency on one he thought of, not without reason, as one of his own converts; and that is Father George Tyrrell, who writes, that "In my crude reaction from chaos toward an extreme sort of ecclesiasticism he taught me that true Catholicism must be before all things evangelical —a religion not merely argued from mere texts of the Gospel, but filled with their anti-legalist democratic spirit. . . . 'A lawless man,' said many who did not see how strictly all these seeming irregularities were governed by one law, and how he brought every such means or method to the test of life and reality. That this test kept him so uniformly on Catholic lines will not surprise those who believe in Catholicism, while it will also explain why he incurred alternate charges of Popery and Protestantism from the indiscriminating adversaries of either cause." He was "in no way surprised" when his intellectual young friend told him he was stepping Rome-wards. The Ritualist asked only that the future Jesuit should see Anglo-Catholicism in full swing. He saw it, but saw through it; and one Palm-Sunday—I don't know whether this story has ever been printed; but I may be forgiven —stepped from the elaborate, seemingly self-conscious ceremonies

of St. Alban's to the little Catholic St. Etheldreda's[3] near by, where an old countrywoman of ours, at the door, asked him, "Is it a bit of palm you'd be wanting?" and then and there sealed Father Tyrrell's fate.

And for this too, we should speak kindly of our brethren who save us from a deeper fall. If they do not become Catholics, they are the human means by which many of us hear the call and answer; they are the means of numerous bodies of men having their ears attuned to the notes of Rome, music to which Rome herself could not get them to listen. And what shall we see, or not see, in the end thereof? Certainly, individuals must submit; they know well when they are moved along that inevitable way. But he would be a bold deceiver amongst us who would deny how far the Almighty Guide of us all may be using the souls in good faith outside the Church to prepare His way in this unintelligible world.

And those are hardened hearts who would not feel that they must do something more unselfish amongst ourselves, must support more missions, must rescue more of the discouraged, disheartened poor, must look after more young men (even as the priests at this Washington Conference implore us), when they hear a Catholic friend of this Protestant clergyman—he would not have called himself Protestant—declare: "This sad world is incalculably the poorer for the loss of him. How absurdly insignificant the so-called great people and great aims and deeds of this world look when we place them side by side with such a man and such a life!" Or, to his sister: "As a Roman Catholic doctor whose life has been spent amongst the poor of the East End of London, may I be permitted in this hour of your bereavement to offer you the sympathy of a heart which is also bleeding for its own loss?

[3] St. Etheldreda's is the only church of old Catholic times now used for Catholic worship in London. It was the chapel of the town house of the Bishops of Ely, in whose garden grew the strawberries loved by King Richard III. Being for sale in the last generation, it was bought back by the Catholics, and nobly restored. It is the London gem of the fourteenth century architecture. In its cloisters is preserved the huge Lion and Unicorn, which, with the new religion, was set up where the Crucifix had stood in the church. Beneath this monstrous image is an inscription deposing to its removal there, "when this church was restored to the Roman obedience." Ely place, where this old chapel stands, is a quiet spot off Holborn.

We of the East End well know what our poor have lost in the death of your saintly brother. You will forgive the offer of my poor sympathy. Its only value is that as a Roman Catholic I know what a devoted celibate priest can do for his flock. My firm belief is that Christianity in England can only be saved by the influence of men like your brother." With his Irish boys; with his London postmen; then, as a clergyman—he was ordained when about thirty-two—with soldiers and sailors and their friends, rich and poor, in Portsmouth slums; there was talking in common, eating in common, singing, smoking and decent amusements of many kinds rough and smooth, all in common. Night after night I have seen him or his assistants in the boys' and young men's gymnasiums, looking after them, protecting them at least from evil influences, and even getting them to church. This indeed was not in the line of those masses who had long been lost to the Church of England, that institution which this, its minister, thought, would die, if it died, of its respectability. In his own church now "two boys calmly lighted their pipes and began to smoke. One remedy alone seemed possible—to seize them by the back of the neck and run them out of church, knocking their heads together as hard as I could. Amazed at first into silence, their tongues recovered themselves before they reached the door, and the rest of the children listened delighted to a vocabulary which I have seldom heard excelled. We had no sooner restored order than the mothers of the two lads put in an appearance. As wine is to water, so was the conversation of the mothers to their sons. I wish I could have closed the children's ears as quickly as I closed the service. But they listened with extreme delight, even following me in a kind of procession headed by the two ladies, to my lodgings." These were the slums where the very games of the brutalized children had to do with the refuse of slaughter houses; where, on his first Sunday, going to church, he found even children looking at a dance in the streets between two sailors in the women's skirts, and two women in the men's trousers, the four stripped to the waist. "All the neighbors looked on amused but unastonished, until one couple, the worse for drink, toppled over. I stepped forward to help them up, but my endeavor was evidently looked at from a hostile point of view,

for the parish voice was translated into a shower of stones, until the unfallen sailor cried out: 'Don't touch the Holy Joe; he doesn't look such a bad sort.'" "The saloon-keepers and those interested in brothels feared him more than all the police and magistrates put together. I well remember," continues a Wesleyan minister,[4] then of Portsmouth, now in the United States, "one instance of his fearlessness which created an immense sensation in the town. He discovered in his parish that a house used as a brothel was the property of one of the senior magistrates of the borough. He then wrote to the magistrate informing him to what a vile use his property was put, and asking him to exercise his right as a landlord to eject the tenant. No notice was taken of the communication, and the evil practices still continued. He sent a second letter, which was likewise ignored. Righteously indignant that a Justice of the Peace should thus openly violate the law, Mr. Dolling, on the following Sunday, stated the facts thus recited, at his men's service,—his famous Sunday afternoon services for men only, when St. Agatha's was packed with those anxious to hear his unconventional talks,—and announced the name of the offender. He was threatened with an action for libel, but was unmoved; and in a few days a lame apology from the solicitors of the man in question appeared in the public press, and the house was closed."

> "So much one man can do,
> That does both act and know."

The priests can fill churches, at missions, with men only; and at the last of our ordinary parochial missions that I know of, the confessions numbered 2,450, of which the men's were more than half. But the priests will not despise the spirit of one whose fight was harder, when he would follow in their train. Indeed, as I know, Cardinal Manning said to one poor English penitent about to leave his country and start fresh in Australia, you could not have a truer friend than Mr. Dolling; and "until you go to confession to a priest, you could not open your mind to any better

[4] "Don't let us be ashamed to confess what we owe to the splendid work of the Dissenters. It makes me oftentimes sick at heart to hear the way in which the newly-ordained, strong in the orthodoxy of his High Church collar and of his grasp of doctrine, speaks of these class leaders, at whose feet he is unworthy to sit."

man." "I never thought I had begun with my boys at all," was this Protestant missioner's judgment, until they have been to confession. And well might a High Church clergyman say to me: 'Anyway, we are doing your work.'" You know these men have, I do not say an uneasy conscience, yet an admitted thought in their minds that perhaps it is we who may win after all; and this clergyman meant that they were preparing Protestant Englishmen to tolerate, to welcome, to adopt Catholicism, and its thoughts of sin. And the more men think about sin, the more they will gravitate to Rome, said that hater of her, the historian Froude. As Mr. Spencer Jones reflected, the High Churchmen of good-will can reach, with words of truth as to Catholicism past and present, those by whom Roman Catholics cannot make themselves heard. Doing our work, expressing the mind of a Manning to those who knew not that great Roman, was an Anglican Dolling, writing in one of the best of London weeklies that "at the Reformation in England, . . . which came from the reigning and upper classes, the people in a large measure lost the idea of the supernatural. Beauty, art, music, and all like things passed out of their lives, or became completely secularized, and the God that remained, seen through the eyes of Calvinism, became a tyrant, who could not long maintain his rule. . . . The Church was in a large measure the servant of the upper classes, and had no message to, or attraction for, the lower. . . . The incomes given in pre-Reformation times, partly for services now discontinued, . . . and partly for the good of the poor, their education and their needs, have become now the prey of the clergyman's wife and his sons and daughters, enabling them to be educated like ladies and gentlemen, and to take their part in upper-class society. Not only is the money their prey, but oftentimes the management of the parish as well. Do you think that you will get workingmen, or any other men, interested in that in which they have neither part nor lot?"

And then the truth about modern High Churchism — the which, with a certain conscious paradox, I suppose, this eclectic declared, in conversation, to be "the most soul-destroying of all forms of religion"—which has, no doubt, largely influenced the upper classes and certain little circles in which the preachers of it

have been zealous and self-sacrificing men; but the great masses here and elsewhere (in England) are practically untouched by it. There remain, indeed, the instinct for religion, and admiration for, if not an acceptance of, what may be called the "natural virtues," and a kind of superstitious belief that makes no demand upon the conduct, far less upon the devotion of him that believes. "We live here (in East London) without God—that is, by far the greater majority of our people do not pray, do not read their Bibles, do not come to church, far less frequent the sacraments, and live, as a rule, altogether unconscious of the supernatural."[5] He had travelled in many European countries; and I have known him say privately that in no country did he think the city poor degraded as he had seen them in England. Such personal degradation, he thought, was impossible in a Catholic country. Mr. Charles Booth's volumes on London bear witness, only too exactly, to the fact that that once Catholic diocese is, as its Protestant bishop says, now "pagan," in so far that ninety-five per cent. of the working classes, he thinks, go to no worship. "When I was ordained," a sermon of Mr. Dolling's declared, "I was sent by Bishop How to a district containing 7,000 people in the East End of London. I don't believe that twenty-five of these were influenced by the Church of England." And an observer like Mr. Booth is sure that still there identification with some religious body means more careful living, higher family life,

[5] In 1869, at the last time, before this year, that the English Church Conference met at Liverpool, that embittered person, Dr. Littledale, gave utterance as below.—I quote a recent Anglican *Church Times*' reminiscence. "In his speech on the Eastern Churches, Dr. Littledale was evidently in a sardonic mood: 'Dr. Tristram [the Low Church opponent] has told you what Protestant teaching would do in Turkey. I will tell you what it has done in some parts of the East. Some years ago a Turk, who had come to grief with his own authorities, went to the English Consul at Bagdad and claimed his interference, on the ground that, though not a British subject, he was an English Protestant. The Consul was doubtful and said to him, 'You an English Protestant?' 'Oh, yes,' replied the man; 'I eat pork and drink wine, I never say my prayers, and I don't believe in a God.'"

The story is not without its significance in these days of "religious" riots and turmoil in Liverpool.

It was this same Ritualist of a bitter day who (though I believe not recognized as a Jansenist) expressed himself with theological inaccuracy, I submit, when he declared that the Reformers were "a set of unredeemed villains."

self-respect, and regard for others. *Religious Life of London*[6] has it, that "four persons out of every five not dwelling in institutions are either careless or hostile as regards public worship." "In South London the poor (except the Roman Catholic poor) do not attend service on Sunday, though there are a few churches and missions which gather some; and forlorn groups can be collected by a liberal granting of relief." The *Times* reviewer (March 4th) notes: "But Mr. Masterman, who writes these words, does not despair, if realities are fairly faced, if there is less belief in machinery, and there are more Father Lowders and Father Dollings." A lame and impotent conclusion, one might say, after looking above. Because, it is another sort of "Father" that seemingly is more successful. In Mr. Dolling's last parish, in London, 200 was a large attendance at church out of a parish of 10,000. His biographer adds, however: "No doubt, had his life been spared, he would have built up out of the children a congregation of earnest worshippers, both men and women, as years went on." So, with Protestant-lapsed masses, it depends on the individual worker (shall we say hero?) to an extent unknown to priests, among their own, however careless. But to-day, is not the apostolic cry in America that, to all, the priests have duties? And if so, here in this *Life* is seen a lesson, a warning, an inspiration. Would that he had found his way by submission, men will say. Would that he had. But what then? He would not have done what he did—and he did much—to make the newer Ritualists popular, to suggest to Englishmen, and to force upon them, that by "Catholicism" only, by the Catholic system, can they ever again have a Christian England. This, too, is a word sounding in the ears of those in our own country who fear divorce, lawless education, sentimentality, and complacency as to sin. And how shall we fight the terror, Socialism? By "realizing the awful words, 'Ye have taken away the key of knowledge; ye enter not in yourselves; and they that were entering in ye hindered.'" For if those who have this world's goods really entered into the spirit of Christ, that spirit would make them utterly dissatisfied until every gift of God that they had in excess, whether for the development of body, soul, or spirit, was expended on

[6] Hodder & Stoughton, 1904.

those who have it not; so that those who have it should supply what is lacking. If these words seem to you too severe, it is just because I know the good that lies hidden away in all these unrefined, non-religious souls.[7] A groping child, this, of his Holy Father, Leo XIII, who laid down that if the question be asked, How must one's possessions be used? the Church replies without hesitation, in the words of a holy Doctor (St. Thomas Aquinas), "man should not consider his outward possessions as his own, but as common to all, so as to share them without difficulty when others are in need. Whoever has received from the Divine Bounty a large share of blessings, has received them for the purpose of using them for the perfecting of his own nature, and at the same time that he may employ them as the ministers of God's providence for the benefit of others."

We are in fear of the hour of reckoning for the present-day enormous monsters of wealth, to whom Burke's leviathan was but a porpoise. They may make that a terrible hour for us all. But is this last tale true—that $36,000,000 can be made in a day without a dollar endangered, but with the consequent ruin, hatred, and despair of thousands of ruined men, women and children? That it is even a possibly true tale would make all tremble, and

[7] Only this year, a leader of London Nonconformity, Mr. Campbell, of the City Temple, has raised a discussion and a storm by his echoing of "the poor in a loomp is bad." And at one meeting a minister declared, amid cries of "True," that foul wrongs had been done to the working classes in the past. Multitudes of them had been sweated for generations. They had their vices, as all classes had; but, though not claiming to be an expert, he would venture to say, the more one saw of the working classes the more one worked for them, the more one admired them, the more one loved them.

"I asked a young engineer who came to see me the other day," said this Mr. Horne, "if he believed in Christ. He said, 'Yes, but the Churches don't.' I said, 'You are making just the same mistake that we are making. We lay our finger on one or two instances, and found on them a sweeping indictment against the working classes.' We have to get back to the Christian point of view. I say the working classes of this country are as Christian as any part of our population. I mean by that, in the ideals they hold, in their capacity for self-denial, in the spirit of brotherhood. They lay no stress upon externals, but they insist on truth in the inward part, and genuineness of character; they believe in the Sermon on the Mount —which some bishops have thrown overboard—and I believe myself that at heart they hold tenaciously by Jesus Christ as the only hope of their order, and the only hope of their salvation, and the reinvigoration of this English nation."

seek again for who is on our side—who? Set thy house in order, lest the evil day come upon thee unprepared. By moral socialism, by intellectual socialism, as Canon Sheehan reflects or hopes, you will kill socialism that is political—that is, socialism tyrannic, materialistic, atheistic, the crown of selfishness, seeking its own for the space of earthly happiness, yet disguised as brotherly love, deceiving and self-deceived.

But why, then, break up the forces of defence, the army of the Cross?

> "Alas! they had been friends in youth;
> But whispering tongues can poison truth."

That is true, as of the individual, so also of our unhappily divided religions. And it is so hard to see aright. Even this open-eyed critic of his Church and State talks like a provincial about "the old Latin service," as of something that once was; much as if the Republic of Panama were to talk of her former sister the United States. And he talks of what he "in this church" does, meaning what amount of Catholic doctrine he introduces within his own four walls; the which he contrasts with the amount within the walls of his neighbor clergy. One would cry, "Let me examine his head;" as Charles Lamb, concerning the gentleman who remarked that Shakespeare was a great poet. Surely another Irish grievance, if its humor evaporates in England. Even the pathos of it all moved him not, when his poor emigrant boys wrote to him that they shrank from going to communion in the Church of England as they found it in Canada, or in most places outside Mr. Dolling's own parish. To a Dublin priest, to whom I lent *Ten Years in a Portsmouth Slum*, it seemed a staggering thing that a mortal man would thus propound a religion on his own authority, if on any. The priest admired; but he wondered. He might well do both. "In some points you prefer Rome, in some Greece, in others England, in others Scotland; and of that preference your own private judgment is the ultimate sanction. What am I to say in answer to conduct so preposterous? Say you go by any authority whatever, and I shall know where to find you, and respect you . . . But do not come to me with the latest fashion of opinion which the world has seen, and protest to me that it is the oldest. Do not come to me at this time of

day with views palpably new, isolated, original, *sui generis*, warranted old neither by Christian nor unbeliever, and challenge me to answer what I have really not the patience to read. Life is not long enough for such trifles."[8]

Early enough in life Dolling showed that independence, that initiative, the resistance to authority, that is so great a quality in many spheres, and so irrational in others. At the seminary, "he lived largely apart from his fellows, and was quite indifferent to the common life. He was very rarely present at any lectures, and seemed to grudge any time spent away from the Mission Church in St. Martin's parish. Nothing would sometimes be seen of him for whole days together. I think he must have regarded his time spent here as an irritating interruption or postponement of his life's work awaiting him. With all his wonderful powers in other directions, his weak point was in a thinly disguised contempt for formal study." At Salisbury Cathedral, where the "seminarians" had to attend, "during the anthem he invariably read some volume, presumably of a religious character, or would audibly remark to his companion on the length and weariness of the service." "Such a man cannot become an endurable Catholic until he has learned to distrust profoundly his own private judgments and impressions; to seek earnestly for supernatural guidance; to realize the all-important truth that the Church is commissioned to teach him, and not he to teach the Church. . . . He spends his life in setting ecclesiastical authority at defiance. He despises the traditions of his fathers. He despises his own bishops; he despises Rome; and, if he were brought into contact with Greeks, he would, no doubt, despise them equally."[9] Still, enough has been said to make one look for the soul of goodness in this evil also. Remember, at all moments, St. Augustine's reproachful cry, that you have not known the difficulty of escaping from the shifting sands of heresies. For the late Mr. Dolling, authority, we are told, was nothing. Yet he repeated creeds. Thank God for it. But—and we do not mean to be profane—the Lord only knows why. And the Lord knows His own.

This at least he did in his ten years in Portsmouth, in his mis-

[8] Newman, *Difficulties of Anglicans*, V.

[9] *Dublin Review*, April, 1866.

sion supported by the great school for rich men's sons, into which has developed the fourteenth century Winchester College, of the foundation of the Catholic Bishop, William of Wykeham. He built a gymnasium (at $10,000); a large parish room ($3,500); a house to be used by charitable ladies ($2,500), for saving and protecting girls and women; twelve almshouses ($2,500), for old and poor married people and widows; the schools ($12,500); and his clergy house ($7,500), open to all—that extraordinary meeting-place of soldiers, sailors, parsons, outcasts, rich youths from Winchester, not to say bishops and peers, when they could put up with fare at the common table. The presiding genius, like Chaucer's frère, was "the beste beggere in his hous."

As I was thinking of him, I read Mr. Edward Clifford's review of his own friend Father Damien's life.[10]

"His vehement, powerful character is well brought out in Father Tauvel's book, and so are his great self-denial and humility. The following story is significant of all his career:

"When the Picpus Fathers were building the chapel of their Louvain house, the younger members assisted the workmen when and where they could. In preparing the site a high and rickety chimney had to be taken down. All the workmen refused the dangerous task. Damien quietly asked for a ladder, got someone to steady it, and fetched down the chimney, brick by brick. The men stared. 'Mon Dieu! quel homme!' they cried.

"His docility is also much praised by Father Tauvel. It is a virtue held in great respect by Roman Catholics; *but*, my own opinion is that any docility he had was an acquired virtue rather than a natural one, for he was essentially a leader, bold, determined, and instant in action."

Of course, we should say. What is the virtue of that curious *but?*

And nigh that, I would place this last criticism on our Anglo-Irish hero of charity—a true one, if not so great. It is a criticism, thinks his sympathetic biographer and intimate friend, "singularly true in its insight." The writer is a naval officer now a Catholic. It is the last word on those free-lances for the right with whom we deal to-day, the Ritualists who hate not Rome:—

[10] Art and Book Co.

"As regards his attitude to the religion of my adoption (the Roman Catholic), what I have said above applies—it was not in him to be otherwise than sympathetic toward so widely held a belief; but, no doubt, much in the Church ran directly contrary to his strongest instincts. The unquestioning obedience, which we think the first of all the virtues (as in a way containing them all), did not, I think, make any appeal to him. Certainly he would not have imitated a man as keenly sympathetic as himself with the outcast, St. Peter Claver, S.J., who ceased his good works promptly when ordered by his superior to do so. Another reason of alienation from us was that he recognized the gulf which separates the main body of the English nation from Popery. A third arose from his confident belief in his own priesthood. In conclusion, I may say that although his views and actions in matters economic and religious were often of a kind to give scandal to a mere theorist, yet he remains to me the nearest approach to a great man with whom I have ever come into personal contact."

His chief work was broken up, because *he* had one opinion concerning prayers for the dead, and his Bishop—this country's recent guest, now Archbishop Davidson—had another. The Bishop had signed the Thirty-nine Articles; and the Articles approve the Homilies; and the Homilies in their wisdom or folly proclaim prayers for the dead to be a vain thing. The High Church would-be mass-priest signs the Articles, too, with what pangs I know not, and reads out publicly his Anglican Prayer-book's only mention of the despised and rejected Holy Mass, in the Articles' stuff about "the Sacrifices of Masses" which are "blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits." But all that is disgustful and unfathomable matter. And let us leave it there.

W. F. P. STOCKLEY.

Halifax, Nova Scotia.

THE RESURRECTION AND FAITH.

AS IT is not uncommonly maintained by theologians that the Resurrection of our Blessed Lord is the foundation of our faith, and as this point of doctrine has recently become an object of all-sided discussion, it may not be amiss to suggest some less obvious remarks and distinctions for the purpose of obtaining a clearer conception of the doctrinal status of the subject.

Strangely enough, the view that the Resurrection is the foundation, or the main foundation (*praecipuum fundamentum*) of faith, would appear to be a modern development of theology. There is no mention of it in the *Summa* of St. Thomas, who with characteristic accuracy rests faith in the Divinity of Jesus Christ,—and shall we not therefore say that he rests faith itself on the word of our Blessed Lord? Christ's teaching is the basis of faith; and this teaching is not so much supported as strengthened and confirmed by miracles. No one has surpassed the Saint in his accurate view of the evidential force that miracles give to doctrine. In the *Tertia Pars* of the *Summa* their evidential character is subjected to a most exhaustive analysis, and the various groups into which they are divided is clearly marked. But there is no special mention of the Resurrection. This is all the more noticeable from the fact that the Saint has devoted not merely an article but an entire question to the miracle of the Transfiguration. Later on, in the course of his treatise on the mysteries of our Blessed Lord's life, and death, and life after death, he deals professedly with the Resurrection. And although he rightly looks upon it as confirmatory of faith, there is naught to show that to his mind it is or is not the foundation of our faith. Suarez and Bellarmine are equally silent. Petavius, who has so much to say, and who speaks so learnedly, of the Incarnation, is in company with St. Thomas. Even so recent a theologian as Billuart follows the lines of his master in treating of the foundations of our belief in the Divinity of Jesus Christ.

I have not been able to find out the theologian who began to speak of the Resurrection as the foundation of our faith. But Le Grand laid great stress upon it in his work, *De Incarnatione Verbi* which reached its second edition in 1754.[1] Doubtless it was due

[1] Diss. III, c. 2.

to the Cartesian method of tracing all conclusions back to one principle. But, however introduced, it seems to have spread, until I presume we may say that it was the more common teaching not merely of Catholic but of Protestant theologians in their controversies with the Deists. Paley uses it with some modifications in his *Evidences*. Perrone urges it in his *Praelectiones*.[2] Schanz gives it a foremost place in his *Christian Apology*.[3] And Rose in his recent work, *Studies on the Gospel*, says: "Jesus Risen is the supreme apologetic fact of the origin of Christianity, the *motive of credibility* which searched the souls of the Apostles and their hearers, and which led them to assent to the mysterious Divinity of the Saviour till then not fully manifested" (p. 259).

We must make a few distinctions in order to get to the heart of our subject.

First of all, it is clear that the Truthfulness of God (*Prima Veritas in dicendo*), and not the Resurrection, is the motive of the assent of faith. If to believe is to take the word of one who sees what we do not see, the ground of such trust must be our conviction of our guarantor's truthfulness. To say that we are led to accept his truthfulness on other grounds does not alter the fact that the motive for accepting the truth is our firm trust in our informant's knowledge and uprightness.

Moreover, we must clearly distinguish the Resurrection from the miracle of the Resurrection. That our Blessed Lord's Body rose is no miracle. All our human bodies will rise, when the moment comes. Nor indeed does the miracle consist in the fact that whereas we shall be raised from the dead, He raised Himself. For it is the same Divine power in both cases that brings back life to the lifeless body. There is even a sense in which it is true to say that it is not the Resurrection but the Death of Jesus Christ that is the greater miracle. The parting between soul and body probably needed a greater exertion of Divine power than their subsequent union on Easter morning. Death would appear to be unnatural to a human nature which was not only endowed with the Beatific Vision, but was caught up into Hypostatic Union with the Son of God.

[2] *Praelectiones Theologicae*, Vol. I, p. 101, Louvain, 1838.

[3] *A Christian Apology*. English Translation. Vol. II, p. 502; Dublin, 1891.

If we go on to analyze not the Resurrection but the miracle of the Resurrection, I suppose we must not maintain that the miraculous element was the fact of being raised up before the Last Judgment. For, not to speak of "the dead who arose and appeared to many" at the moment of our Blessed Lord's death and therefore before His Resurrection, we believe that Our Blessed Lady's body was raised to life and now dwells in Heaven. Moreover, we cannot say that the miracle consists in the fact that our Blessed Lord's Risen Body never again suffered death, and that this distinguishes it from the child and man who were raised by the prayers and power of Eliseus. For, to make the difference depend on the fact that whereas the bodies of the child and man did see death again and the body of our Blessed Lord did not is really to appeal away from the Resurrection to the Ascension, and to prove the thesis by renouncing it.

Indeed, whether we agree or disagree with those who make no distinction between the Resurrection and the miracle of the Resurrection, we must own that the point of view we have hitherto taken would not serve as the foundation of faith. Thus, if the mere fact of resurrection proves the divinity and truthfulness of the risen person, then every human being is divine and truthful, for we shall all rise again. Furthermore, if the proof of our Blessed Lord's Divinity and Truthfulness is based, not on the fact that He rose, but on the fact that He raised Himself, faith is set up on faith. For it is clear that we cannot prove, we can only believe, that Christ rose by His own power. History and experience may undoubtedly prove that whereas He was dead, He afterwards came to life again. But what no positive science can prove, or disprove, is the cause of this resurrection. Faith can believe it. But then the fact that He rose by His own power becomes the object of faith, and cannot possibly be the motive of faith.

It may well be asked, "What, then, is the miracle, the distinctive miracle of the Resurrection?" It consists in a definite prophecy of the Resurrection, and a certain fulfilment of that prophecy. Twice at least did our Blessed Lord formally declare that He would rise to life after death, even as He declared that He would be raised up to everlasting life, on the right hand of the

Father. In answer to the Jews who inquired of Him by what sign and, therefore, by what authority He made bold to drive the horde of sellers and money-lenders from the Temple, St. John reports Him to have said: "Destroy this Temple and in three days I will raise it up. . . . But He spoke of the temple of His Body."[4] Again, St. Matthew and St. Luke substantially agree in narrating the second prophecy. According to St. Matthew, some of the Scribes and Pharisees, having attributed the casting out of a blind and dumb devil to Beelzebub, the prince of devils, were hardened enough to ask for a sign. This effrontery drew upon them the biting words of our Lord: "An evil and adulterous generation seeketh a sign, and a sign shall not be given it but the sign of Jonas the prophet . . . for the Son of Man shall be in the heart of the earth three days and three nights."[5] St. Matthew mentions also that, after the miraculous multiplication of the seven loaves and a few fishes, the Pharisees tempting Him asked for a "sign from heaven." This second display of effrontery met the same stern reply: "A wicked and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign, and a sign shall not be given it but the sign of Jonas the prophet."[6] It is remarkable that the three Evangelists represent these prophecies as an answer to the ill-minded demands of the Scribes, Pharisees, and Sadducees. As the Sadducees denied the Resurrection, there was a special reason why that doctrine should be set before them.

We find, then, that our Saviour prophesied that He would rise again three days after His death. He rose again even as He had foretold. This was the miracle of the Resurrection; and this miracle linked with the prophecy makes a strong argument for the Truthfulness of Him who prophesied and rose again. But, if we may be allowed to anticipate, in these various appeals to the Resurrection, what we do not find is any clear statement that the Resurrection is the foundation of faith. Indeed, St. Thomas seems to hold the contrary. "They sought a sign from heaven. But they were unworthy to see one. Yet He gave one to the Apostles, who saw Him ascending, and saw the glory of God on the Mount."[7]

[4] John 2: 19–21.
[5] Matt. 12: 39–40.
[6] Matt. 16: 4.
[7] St. Th., in Matt., *loc. cit.*

Another distinction must be made between faith, and the faith of the Apostles. Viewed in the abstract, faith is an acceptance of Revelation on the word of the Revealer; in the concrete, the faith of the Apostles was the conviction that Jesus of Nazareth could not tell an untruth because of the Divinity that lay hidden within Him. Now as abstract faith is not concrete faith, so the motive of abstract faith may not be the motive of concrete faith, and *vice versa*. How often do we find souls reaching the faith by paths which defy mere abstract logic. The conversions described for us in the New Testament are not set before us as models of the abstract way or motives of reaching belief. As a rule the Personality of Jesus Christ is its own guarantee. He finds His own everywhere, and merely by showing Himself. Even St. Peter and St. John, if called upon to give the reasons and the motives of their conversion before an academy of psychologists, would perhaps make but a sorry figure. The analysis of St. Paul's instantaneous conversion is felt to be something beyond the jurisdiction of mere formal logic. The intensity and intuition of that supreme moment cannot fitly be expressed in any mood of the syllogism. Being primarily a matter of heart and will it can ill be expressed in terms of mere ratiocination.

We are thus led on to look upon the Resurrection—or, to be quite accurate, upon the appearance of the Risen Christ—as the proximate motive, not of the Apostles' faith, but of their restoration to faith. It would seem necessary to insist upon these distinctions, however complex they appear, if we would not maintain that until the Resurrection they had no faith, or no real grounds for faith, in Him whom St. Peter by Divine Revelation confessed to be "the Son of the Living God." Unless we are to look upon the Apostles as lacking faith, even when they were making profession of it, we shall find it hard to look upon the appearance of the Risen Christ as their "motive of credibility." To be quite accurate, as well as to be quite consistent with what the Evangelists record of the conversion and subsequent history of the twelve, we must own that, although the personality of Jesus Christ had won its rightful victory over them at first sight, their faith in no way ceased to be faith.

It is of the essence of faith to be the acceptance of the unseen

From the standpoint of reason faith must ever have reasons for and against. It is incompatible with doubt; yet, as things are, it is impossible without difficulties. Once the Apostles received faith, their subsequent history was that of every one who is asked to accept the Infinite with all its mysteriousness. They were not always at their best. Sometimes the difficulties in their way made them hesitate. Again they met objections by triumphant denials. Then came the Mystery of the Garden, of the captivity, the scourging, the crown of thorns, the death and, lastly, the tomb. It is no great reproach to say that they lost their hold over the Infinite in the gloom of Olivet and Calvary, when even He who had taught them and on whom they leaned, cried out: "My God! My God! why hast Thou forsaken Me?" With the appearance of the Risen Saviour, however, the battle of faith entered upon its last phase. It is significant that before the Apostles were granted the sight of Jesus risen in the flesh they seem to have made up their minds to take a dispassionate, a rational, and, so to say, a masculine view of the apparitions. They would not be misled by mere womanish fancies. The Apostle St. Thomas is the extreme type of their common attitude of unprejudiced expectation. Yet it should be noted that their dispassionate unprejudicedness broke down at the first sight of their Risen Master. It is not even said that St. Thomas accepted the invitation to put his finger in the marks of the wounds and his hand into the open side; as if we might be allowed to think that, before the words of the invitation were ended, the doubts that filled the soul of the Apostle had yielded at the presence of the Master.

To the Apostles, then, the Resurrection of their Saviour was the resurrection of their faith. And as He died no more, so their faith died no more. For ten days after His Ascension they waited without a sign from Heaven for the fulfilment of His Word. Their faith never wavered through the long gloom of that second orphanage, thrice as long as the entombment. For ten days they prayed and hoped until the Holy Spirit came and with Him that gift of fortitude and perfect faith which kept them firm to the end in spite of sufferings and death.

But in looking back, as they would necessarily look back upon the past with its waverings between faith and lukewarmness, noth-

ing would stand out so markedly as the Resurrection of their Master. Everything would serve to remind them of it,—His first meeting with them, their earliest faith, their fall, their own spiritual resurrection, the martyr's death that so soon awaited them. The darkness that fell upon their souls when they denied Him or doubted Him would heighten the certitude with its rest and peace that came to them when they first looked at His Risen Body. No one would expect them in their long years of self-accusation to analyze with all the dispassionateness of a psychologist the work that had been going on unobtrusively in their souls for the three years of their fellowship with their Master. It is always so in souls who have a crisis in their lives, which has been prepared for by a fall. The very intensity of the repentance leads them to pass over the sub-conscious work that, perhaps, has taken years to finish. They see the drama of their life in two zones,—one of utter darkness and sin, symbolizing their fall; and one of overwhelming light and mercy, symbolizing their resurrection.

We must, then, be careful to keep apart the concrete question of the Apostles' faith from the abstract question of faith. It is evident that to the Apostles the Resurrection would seem to be the one foundation on which rested all that they believed. And in a measure this would be true. His appearance in the flesh after death was the cause of their restoration to faith; and we know that this restoration was without further failure. The Resurrection was as the last grain that turned the scale, not because it is last, but because it has behind it the momentum of all, even from the first.

But this does not justify us in making the abstract assertion that the Resurrection is the foundation of faith. For, as we have already said, the Apostles must have believed in Christ before they witnessed the miracle of the Resurrection. Indeed if we may accept the view of St. Thomas,[8] so great was their faith that they believed in Jesus Christ before witnessing any miracles. Miracles increase faith; and thereby argue a partial lack of it. The Resurrection was manifested only to those whose want of perfect faith called for additional confirmation of the already manifest Truthfulness and Divinity of Jesus Christ. The faithful women brought

[8] P. III, Qu. 1, A. 1: 3m.; *ibid.*, 3: 3m.

spices to the sepulchre as if for a corpse. To St. Mary Magdalen the empty tomb did not suggest that He who had raised her brother had now risen Himself, but that His Body had been stolen. On the other hand, as we cannot associate a moment's doubt with the absolute love and loyalty of Mary, the Mother of Jesus, so may we thus enter into the reason why there is no mention of any meeting between the Risen Saviour and His Mother. Had He visited her who so nobly stood by His Cross, it would not have been to confirm her faith or hope, but to deepen the love which she had always borne Him. Long before His public life had begun with its display of wonders, Mary and Joseph had given their whole faith to the Fruit of her womb. St. Joseph had never witnessed any of his Foster-Son's miracles. Yet was his faith of the strongest. And if faith in its highest exercise does not need any other miracle but that of a perfect human life, it would be idle to maintain that because the faith of the Apostles came back to them at the sight of Christ risen, the Resurrection of Christ is therefore the foundation of faith.

We began our remarks by saying that the Resurrection of Jesus Christ was not uncommonly looked upon as the foundation or the main foundation of faith; or, in other words, as the main argument for faith. We must next distinguish between the strongest or main argument in itself and the strongest argument for us. We do not pretend to have made any discovery. We merely hope to apply an obvious principle employed by St. Thomas up and down his many works. Thus, in speaking of the proofs of the existence of God, the Angelic Doctor lays it down that the proof from movement is the clearest, although it is by no means the strongest in itself. Moreover, the most persuasive literary forms are not syllogistic, though the syllogism is the most logical mould into which an argument can be fitted. Indeed in matters of difficulty it is almost safe to hold that the most persuasive argument cannot be the strongest. This is but to reaffirm in other words the distinction already drawn between the abstract and the concrete.

Now it must be borne in mind that the office of the Apostles was apostolic. They had no wish to usurp the functions of the philosophers. St. Paul's scorn for dialectics has made him forget

his consummate examples of it. The Apostles did not covet the reputation, or copy the method of theologians. Their mission was to preach the good tidings and to preach to crowds of eager listeners, amongst whom there were "not many wise." Their apologetic was that of the pulpit, not that of the library. They themselves were no mean part of the argument for the truthfulness of their message. Not the least part of their success was due to what they were, rather than to what they said; though, to be sure, it is almost impossible to separate the men from their message. When they appealed to anything outside themselves it was for the most part to something striking, something at which even the most unlearned mind would not stumble, something that could be verified at a moment's notice, something which it was not easy to deny without setting aside a number of facts which only a rooted prejudice could deny. The empty tomb, sealed with official wax and guarded by picked men, was, so to speak, a public document which none could gainsay. To the Jews, then, there was a special apologetic reason for appealing to the Resurrection. It was a known fact. To deny it was to be driven upon the rocks. There was every reason why in his first sermon to all "them who were dwelling at Jerusalem," St. Peter should remind them of the Resurrection. Nevertheless he did not forget to lay stress, and perhaps even greater stress, on the evident miracle of the Ascension and the public miracle which they had witnessed of the coming down of the Holy Ghost. "Being exalted therefore by the right hand of God and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, He hath poured forth this which you see and hear."[9] Nor does the preacher forget the mysterious prophecy of the Ascension, so well known to all devout Jews: "The Lord said to my Lord: Sit Thou at My right hand, until I make Thy enemies Thy footstool."[10]

Later on in his Second Epistle, St. Peter lays great stress on the Transfiguration, which strangely enough is the one miracle singled out by St. Thomas. "For we have not by following artificial fables made known to you the power and presence of our Lord Jesus Christ. But we were eye-witnesses of His greatness. For He received from God the Father honor and glory, this voice

[9] Acts 2: 33, 34.

[10] Ps. 109: 1.

coming down to Him from the excellent glory: 'This is My beloved Son in whom I am well pleased. Hear ye Him.' And this voice we heard brought from heaven, when we were with Him in the holy mount."[11]

Turning now from the preaching of St. Peter to that of St. Paul, there is a well known passage in the latter's First Epistle to the Corinthians which may have occasioned the undue stress laid upon the miracle of the Resurrection. "If Christ be not risen again, then is our preaching vain and your faith also is vain."[12] The meaning of these words seems so plainly against much that we have argued for, that a word or two of commentary is obviously necessary.

The Corinthians being Greeks and not Jews assembled in Jerusalem, the patent fact of the empty tomb had no special apologetic value. Yet Christ Risen took a new apologetic interest. From time immemorial the bent of the Grecian mind had been toward discussing the immortality of the human personality. To the classical Greeks the supreme question was Life,—intellectual life, moral life. Thus passion for fame was a dream of everlasting life, if not in reality, at least in the minds and admiration of others. Now we must agree with St. Thomas that practically speaking the immortality of the personality stands or falls by the immortality of the body. Of course it need not be so. Yet to quote the words of St. Thomas: "If we deny the resurrection of the body, we cannot easily hold the immortality of the soul." St. Paul[13] well knew the interest he would create when he told the men of Athens that he himself had seen a man raised from the dead. His proselytes at Corinth seem to have scrupled at this doctrine, some boldly denying the resurrection and basing their denial on the nature of the body. Their denial had the effect of drawing forth a philosophical reply from St. Paul, who bases his doctrine of immortality on the sound metaphysical basis of spirituality and consequent incorruptibility of the principle of life.

But whilst we admit that even for the Greek mind the immortality of the body was an important and indeed an all-important topic, we should be mistaking apostolic preaching for abstract

[11] II Pet. 1: 16–18.
[12] I Cor. 15: 14.
[13] In I ad Cor., *loc. cit.*

theology, if we maintained that the Resurrection of Christ was thereby the foundation of our duties. We readily admit that to the Greeks there were three truths on which the religious synthesis of the world rested,—the existence of an Intelligent and Personal First Cause; free-will, and immortality. We are even content to hold that there is a sense in which the responsibility of these truths springs out of the conviction of immortality. And it was under this conviction that St. Paul preached the resurrection of the body to men who could only be stirred to the responsibilities of their present life under the pressure of a life to come. But this apologetic instinct of St. Paul must nowhere be pressed into a dogma that the Revelation of Jesus Christ rests on His Resurrection.

Moreover, to grapple with the text at close quarters, it is clear that St. Paul is not arguing with his Corinthian proselytes about faith in general, but about faith in the resurrection of the body. "Now if Christ be preached that He rose again from the dead, how do some among you say that there is no resurrection of the dead?" (v. 12) The argument from the resurrection is final Metaphysics had supplied the objection. But no *a priori* reasoning can oust a fact. St. Paul's answer to the objection that "no man could rise" was that "Jesus Christ had risen." It would have been beside the point to appeal to the Ascension or to any other mystery or miracle of our Lord's life. The complete and practical answer was the Resurrection of Jesus Christ; and St. Paul was too skilful an apologist to overlook it.

It is clear that when St. Paul speaks of the denial of the Resurrection being the overthrow of faith, he was speaking of faith in the resurrection of the body. But granting, what we should not grant, that he had in view the complete cycle of faith and not one doctrine, it is impossible to show that he rests the Resurrection solely or even chiefly on the empty tomb. His words are: "If Christ be not risen again, then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain." But he could also have said with equal truth: "If Christ is not dead—or buried or ascended, your faith is vain. If the gates of hell will ever prevail against the Church, your faith is vain." In other words, if any of our Blessed Lord's promises were to fail, His Truthfulness and His

Divinity would likewise fail, and our faith would be vain. To assert that our faith would be vain were it proved that Christ did not ascend into heaven, is clearly not the same as to assert that the Ascension is the foundation of faith. *Malum est ex quocumque defectu; bonum est ex integra causa.* One point disproved, and all is disproved. One point proved, and all is not proved. And hence, although it is true that the denial of the Resurrection is the denial of faith, it need not be true to say that the affirmation of the Resurrection is the affirmation of faith.

As what we have hitherto said has been mainly critical and negative, we must endeavor to add something positive, where it is so difficult to avoid the little less or more that jeopardizes truth.

The Resurrection, whilst it is not the foundation of faith, is a foundation of faith. Moreover, there is a sense in which it is the *main* or the clearest foundation of faith. It appeals to the hearer when clearly enforced by a ready speaker. And in comparison with other public miracles wrought by our Blessed Lord it may be even considered the greatest of His miracles. But here we must suggest an attitude of reserve. For it would seem that the Incarnation, the miraculous Conception and Birth, the Death, and the Ascension are greater works than the union between two entities whose parting was a miracle.

As we have said before, a strong argument may be drawn from the fact that Jesus prophesied His Resurrection on the third day and the fulfilment of the prophecy, even though there was no eye to witness whether He rose on the third day or on the second or on the first. And this argument may be sufficiently strong in concrete cases to restore or to beget faith.

To appreciate the true position of the Resurrection we must contrast it, say, with the Transfiguration, which is the only pure miracle recorded by all four Evangelists. We have the word of St. Thomas that, whereas the Resurrection was an earthly sign (*signum de terra*), the Ascension and the Transfiguration were heavenly signs (*signum de coelo*). Now this last most mysterious miracle was witnessed by three Apostles who were especially chosen out for the honor—Peter, John, and James. When we examine into the reason why these and no others were chosen, we find that they were the three who, in so short a time, were to be

eye-witnesses of the still more mysterious agony and seeming collapse in the Garden. No great discernment is needed to see in the Transfiguration the answer to all the difficulties that would spring up from the gloom of the olive-grove. In His unspeakable mercy He who planned to show His chosen three the depths of weakness which He could reach, had prepared them by a splendid vision of the glory that always went with Him, even though it went unseen.

But our Blessed Lord was destined to suffer not only a bitter agony but a cruel death. For that baptism of blood He came into the world. To redeem us He had to pay the heavy ransom of His life. When that ransom had been paid to the full, the Redemption was complete. The later history of the world of souls was but the narrative of how Redemption was applied to those that needed redeeming. Yet as the Redeemer claimed to be not only the Way and the Truth, but the Life, His death could not fail to raise up most telling objections against His person and teaching. The taunt, "If Thou be the Son of God, come down from the cross," still remains a stumbling-block to those who cannot easily realize the unseen. If, then, Peter and John and James needed the Transfiguration to counterbalance the difficulties of the Agony, if the glory of Thabor was needed to light up the gloom of the olive-grove, surely the Apostles and disciples needed some sign to raise their minds up amidst the desolation of Calvary. The dead Christ demanded the risen Christ. The scene by the lake-side lit up the darkness of Golgotha. We do not mean to suggest that the Body of Christ could for ever remain in the tomb; but that whereas His Resurrection need not have been visible, the visible death and entombment created a practical necessity for a visible risen Christ. Thus the argument of the Resurrection, although not absolutely necessary for the proof of faith, is practically necessary for the meeting of objections against that proof. And though we do not mean to call the Resurrection an after-thought, it is evident that the Death and Redemption are the first thought. Only when the Death had been decreed, did the Resurrection from death become a practical necessity in order that death should be robbed of its sting, not merely in regard to Him who died, but still more in regard to those who might well have allowed their simple faith to be scandalized by His Death.

Having laid down this explanation of the economy of the Resurrection, it will be seen how widely we dissociate ourselves from those who seem to rest the whole of Christian faith and Revelation on one episode of the Incarnation; when, indeed, their belief in Christ's word rests on the belief in Christ's moral character; and a belief in Christ's moral character may practically, but does not necessarily, call for miraculous confirmation. Assuredly it is an excusable wish to synthesize the totality of Revelation by reference to one event; and thereby to find a foothold of fact on which to raise the edifice of Revelation. But such a method is really an attempt to carry into theology the principle which Descartes employed so disastrously in Metaphysics. It is an attempt to rest a pyramid on its apex, and we need not be surprised if it meets with the success of all such ill-advised efforts.

Theologians should never forget the philosophical cautiousness of their master, St. Thomas. In his profound analysis of the proofs of the Resurrection he adds that, even if each argument does not prove the Resurrection perfectly, nevertheless all the arguments taken together do prove it perfectly.[14] He thereby suggests to us that no single witness had evidence enough to satisfy mere abstract reasoning,—though faith is not a matter of abstract reasoning, but of personal contact and confidence. And if, logically speaking, there can be difficulties against the Resurrection, even as there are divergent accounts in the Gospel narratives of the Resurrection,—if it can be urged that it was not a real body which the Apostles touched and saw, but a body like that assumed by the Archangel Raphael, we must not jeopardize faith by resting it on a point which was not meant to bear the whole burden. We must not divide Christ; we must not choose out one truth from His doctrine, or one episode from His life, or one miracle from His work. The foundation of faith is Christ Himself,—not one miracle, or one deed, or one mystery. His message and its confirmation are one because they are a whole wrought out of many parts. When we would separate a part, we are thrown back upon the whole. When we would estimate the whole, we are sent on to the parts. "Life and Death in Him agree," to use the poet's words. It is His Personality that wins

[14] P. III, Qu. 55. Art. 6, ad 1[m].

us. We do not mean that, logically speaking, we cannot isolate one point of His teaching or one miracle from the whole, and, having done this, go on, with various distinctions, to call the Resurrection the "*praecipuum fundamentum*" of Faith. But taking Christ as He was and is, and faith as it is and was, we must rest faith on the whole Christ and not on one episode of His Incarnation.

We are thus led on to wonder if belief in the Truthfulness and Divinity of Jesus Christ does not become easier as ages pass. For with the passing of the centuries we witness no passing of His work: "Christ dieth now no more." It is but a narrow view of His divine dispensation to look upon His work as ending with the "*Consummatum est.*" Surely it is still going on. He is always with us, and if so, always working His one work, always cleansing sin, always confirming truth, always fulfilling His promises. It is sometimes said that in the Resurrection we have a historic basis for faith; and in these days when history is in full honor, this historic resurrection is no mean argument. But as historic certainty is but a halting certainty at best, is it not faint praise to qualify the mystery of the Risen Christ with such a title? Assuredly, the Resurrection is historically certain; assuredly it is a foundation of faith and, if you will, the main foundation on which we build the faith. But the one absolute foundation is Jesus Christ Himself,—His life which still energizes and radiates from ten thousand centres; His doctrine which still blossoms and fruits, and feeds the hungry;—His work which still remains a marvel to those who behold and a miracle to those who examine. Were it granted, as perhaps it should be granted, that history becomes less and less evident as years go on, and were it a fact that the Gospel proofs of the Resurrection were destroyed, Christ's character, teaching, work as handed down through the ages to our own age, would be enough to bring the conviction of faith to the clean of heart, whose privilege it has always been to see God. We of to-day believe, not merely or mainly the Christ of yesterday, but the Christ of to-day,—the Christ of the Church; the Christ who smote heresy at Nicea and Constantinople and Trent and the Vatican; the Christ who has renewed the face of the earth; the Christ who has made poverty and chastity rise from

the dead; the Christ who still reigns; the Christ who is inspiring lofty ideals and struggling against a reversion to pagan instincts; the Christ who is everywhere laid in tombs, sealed and guarded, and is everywhere rising up transfigured by His victory over death; "Jesus Christ, yesterday and to-day, and the same for ever." So powerful, too, is this Christ of to-day that instead of accepting Him by reason of the Easter miracle which took place nineteen centuries ago, the souls over whom He reigns and in whom He works are prepared to accept that past episode in His history by reason of His present glory. Not that they take a narrow view of that splendid triumph over death and sin; but they look on it as only natural that whoever can do the greater can do the less, and that He who through nineteen centuries has raised countless souls to life, should not suffer His Body to lie for ever under the heel of death.

VINCENT MCNABB, O.P.

Woodchester, England.

Analecta.

EX ACTIS SUMMI PONTIFICIS.

ARCHIDIOCESIS OREGONOPOLITANA DIVIDITUR, ET NOVA DIOECESIS BEKERIENSIS ERIGITUR, IN STATIBUS FOED. AMER. SEPT.

LEO PP. XIII.

AD PERPETUAM REI MEMORIAM.

Supremi apostolatus munus Nobis commissum ab Alto postulat, ut Ecclesiarum omnium regimini consulamus, eaque mature praestemus, quae rei sacrae procurationi aeternaeque fidelium saluti bene, prospere, feliciterque eveniant. Haec animo repetentes, cum Venerabiles Fratres Archiepiscopus et Episcopi provinciae ecclesiasticae Oregonopolitanae in Statibus Foederatis Americae Septentrionalis enixe a Nobis postulaverint, ut ad incrementum religionis et maius bonum animarum nova Dioecesis erigeretur in illis partibus per dismembrationem nimis amplae Archidioecesis Oregonopolitanae, Nos, collatis consiliis cum VV. FF. NN. S. R. E. Cardinalibus negotiis Propagandae Fidei praepositis, votis huiusmodi annuendum existimavimus. Quae cum ita sint, perpensis sedulo studio rerum adiunctis, nec non attenta commendatione Venerabilis Fratris Diomedis Falconio Delegati Apostolici in

praefata regione, motu proprio atque ex certa scientia et matura deliberatione Nostris, deque Apostolicae potestatis plenitudine, praesentium vi, ex Archidioecesi Oregonopolitana distrahimus sexdecim Comitatus, nempe Baker, Crook, Gilliam, Grant, Harney, Klamath, Lake, Malheur, Morrow, Sherman, Umatilla, Union, Wallowa, Wasco, Wheeler, Stockman, atque ex his novam Dioecesim cum Episcopali residentia in Baker City, a qua ipsa Bekeriensis nomen habebit, et cum Cathedratico discreto arbitrio Episcopi pro sua mensa Episcopali imponendo erigimus. Decernentes praesentes litteras firmas, validas et efficaces existere et fore, suosque plenarios et integros effectus sortiri et obtinere, illisque ad quos spectat et spectare poterit in omnibus et per omnia plenissime suffragari, sicque in praemissis per quoscumque iudices ordinarios et delegatos iudicari et definiri debere, atque irritum et inane si secus super his a quoquam quavis auctoritate, scienter vel ignoranter, contigerit attentari. Non obstantibus Nostra et Cancellariae Apostolicae regula de iure quaesito non tollendo, aliisque Constitutionibus et Ordinationibus Apostolicis, caeterisque contrariis quibuscumque.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum sub anulo Piscatoris die XIX Iunii MDCCCCIII, Pontificatus Nostri anno vigesimo sexto.

A. *Card.* Macchi.

E S. CONGREGATIONE INDULGENTIARUM.

I.

Singuli sacerdotes non obligantur, sed adhortantur ad recitandam in fine Missae invocationem "Cor Iesu Sacratissimum, miserere nobis."

Ab hac S. Congr. Indulgentiis Sacrisque Reliquiis praeposita, quoad Decretum *Urbis et Orbis* die 17 Iunii 1904, quo concedebantur Indulgentiae pro invocatione "*Cor Iesu Sacratissimum, miserere nobis*," quaesitum est:

I. An ad lucrandas Indulgentias sufficiat, ut Sacerdos dicat tantum "Cor Iesu Sacratissimum," et populus respondeat "Miserere nobis?"

II. An eiusdem invocationis recitatio, addenda precibus iam indictis post Missae celebrationem, sit obligatoria?

Et S. Congregatio respondendum censuit:

"Ad 1^um. *Affirmative.*

"Ad 2^um. *Quamvis obligatio proprii nominis a Summo Pontifice imposita non sit, vult tamen Beatissimus Pater, ut uniformitati consulatur, ac proinde singuli sacerdotes ad eam invocationem recitandam adhortentur.*"

Datum Romae ex Secretaria eiusdem S. C., die 19 Augusti 1904.

A. *Card.* TRIPEPI, *Praef.*

L. † S. † D. PANICI, *Archiep. Laodicen., Secret.*

II.

CARDINALES IN SUIS TITULIS AC DIOECESIBUS 200, ARCHIEPI 100, ET EPI 50 DIERUM INDULG. ELARGIRI VALEANT IN PERPETUUM.

DECRETUM.

Pontificale Iubilaeum fel. rec. Leonis XIII, solemnibus ubique laetitiis ab orbe catholico peractum, congruam sane occasionem praebuit, qua plures sacrorum Antistites, praesertim ex regione Neapolitana et Sicula, ad auspicatum eventum novo quodam pietatis religiosique fructus pignore consecrandum, enixas, coniunctis simul litteris, preces admoverunt, ut sua, in indulgentiis elargiendis, facultas aliquantum ab Apostolica Sede adaugeretur.—Has vero postulationes, Pontificis optimi obitu, interceptas, sed, ex S. Congregationis Indulgentiis Sacrisque Reliquiis praepositae consulto, ab infrascripto Cardinali, eidem Congregationi praefecto, in audentia die 28 Augusti, hoc vertente anno, ad Vaticanum habita, rursum et suppliciter exhibitas, cum primum agnovit Sanctissimus Dominus Noster Pius Papa Decimus, nihil se in votis magis habere est testatus, quam ut gloriosam Antecessoris memoriam digno, hac etiam in re, honoris documento prosequeretur, et propriam insuper, erga universos ecclesiasticos ordines, paternam charitatem oppido ostenderet. Quapropter Sanctitas Sua, percepta omnium relatione, non modo memoratis votis annuere, verum etiam clementer decernere dignata est, ut in posterum E.mi Patres Cardinales, in suis titulis aeque ac Dioecesibus, *bis centum* Archiepiscopi *centum*, atque denique Episcopi *quinquaginta* dierum indulgentiam elargiri valeant, dum tamen serventur cuncta huc usque ab eisdem

servata, in huiusmodi indulgentiarum elargitionibus. Hanc autem concessionem futuris quoque temporibus perpetuo valituram extare voluit. Contrariis quibuscumque non obstantibus.

Datum Romae ex Secretaria S. Congregationis Indulgentiis Sacrisque Reliquiis praepositae, die 28 Augusti an. 1903.

A. *Card.* TRIPEPI, *Praef.*

L. ✝ S.

Pro R. D. FRAN. SOGARO, *Archiep. Amid., Secret.*
IOSEPHUS MARIA *Can.* COSELLI, *Subst.*

E S. CONGR. EPISCOPORUM ET REGULARIUM.

I.

ELECTIO DUORUM CONSANGUINEORUM REGULARIUM IN CONSILIARIOS EIUSDEM CAPITULI VALIDA EST.

Beatissime Pater,

Victor Bourdenne, Superior Generalis Presbyterorum a Sacratissimo Corde Iesu a Betharram, ad pedes Sanctitatis Vestrae provolutus, humiliter petit solutionem casus sequentis, qui nuper in Collegio Sancti Ioseph in civitate Bonearensi Americae meridionalis occurrit:

Renovata est, iuxta Instituti Constitutiones, huius Collegii Administratio, Superior scilicet et locale capitulum ex quatuor Consiliariis constans. In quo Consiliariorum numero, duo fratres carnales beneficio suffragiorum simul admissi sunt.

Ex duobus, maior natu in primo scrutinio pene unanimi omnium consensu electus est cum duobus aliis Patribus. Minor vero, postquam in tribus aliis scrutiniis ne medietatem quidem votorum tulit tandem in quinto, quod est ultimum, maioris eligentium partis suffragia obtinuit.

Quum autem illa duorum fratrum in Capitulo de quo agitur praesentia legibus civilibus et Sacris Canonibus adversari videatur, ut ex Constitutione *Exponi nobis* Urbani Papae VIII liquet, et tamen de hoc Constitutiones nostrae sileant, potius habui ad Beatitudinem Vestram querelas hac occasione exortas deferre et pro solutione recurrere, suppliciter postulando: 1° Quid summae Vestrae auctoritati decernere in casu libeat; 2° An prohibitio

Constitutionis *Exponi nobis* applicanda sit in similibus consanguineorum in gradu haud remotiori electionibus, sive pro Capitulo cuiusque domus, sive pro Capitulo Generali totius Instituti, si forte obvenerint, puta si avunculus et nepos, si duo consobrini simul ad idem Capitulum Consiliariorum electi fuerint. — Et Deus . . .

Et Sacra Congregatio E.morum ac Rev.morum S. R. E. Cardinalium negotiis et consultationibus Episcoporum et Regularium praeposita, attentis expositis, super praemissis dubiis respondendum censuit:

"Ad 1^um^. *Electionem esse validum in casu.*

"Ad 2^um^. *Negative in omnibus.*

Datum Romae e Secretaria eiusdem S. Congregat., die 2 Iulii 1904.

D. *Card.* FERRATA, *Praef.*

L. + S. PHILIPPUS GIUSTINI, *Secret.*

II.

SUPERIORISSA NEQUIT EX SEIPSA DENEGARE SUIS SORORIBUS CONFESSARIUM EXTRAORDINARIUM, ETIAM OB MOTIVA EXTRINSECA, QUAE, IUDICIO, ORDINARII, ERUNT SUBIICIENDA.

Beatissime Pater,

P. D. Maurus Serafini, Abbas Generalis Congregationis Cassinensis a primaeva Observantia O. S. B., ad pedes Sanctitatis Tuae provolutus, humiliter proponit dubium prout sequitur circa Decretum quod incipit "*Quemadmodum*," datum die 17 Decembris 1890 de Confessariis Monialium.

Licet 17 Augusti 1891 Sacra Congregatio Episcoporum et Regularium responderit ad 2: "Superiorem teneri subditi precibus semper indulgere quamvis plane videat necessitatem esse fictam, et vel scrupulis vel alio mentis defectu ut veram ab ipso petente apprehensam;" insuper ad 3: "Religiosam petentem eligere posse inter diversos ab Ordinario deputatos, qui sibi munus Confessarii impleat;" nihilominus nonnullae Sanctimonialium vel Sororum Religiosarum Superiores adhuc contendunt sibi licere, decisis non obstantibus, Sorori petenti Confessarium, quem prae caeteris mavult, denegare ex motivis, uti aiunt, extrinsecis.

Quaeritur utrum, saltem ob motiva huius generis, Superiorissa licite possit Confessarium ex deputatis a Sorore electum ipsi denegare? Et Deus, etc.

Et S. Congregatio Negotiis et Consultationibus Episcoporum et Regularium praeposita, omnibus sedulo perpensis, die 5 Augusti 1904 respondit: "*Negative;* sed si adsint rationes vere graves, Superiorissa eas subiiciat Ordinario, cuius iudicio standum erit."

D. *Card.* FERRATA, *Praef.*

L. ✝ S. PHILIPPUS GIUSTINI, *Secret.*

E S. R. UNIV. INQUISITIONE.

I.

CIRCA FORMAM PRO CONFERENDO BAPTISMO IN LINGUA GILBERTANA.

Beatissime Pater,

Vicarius Apostolicus Insularum Gilberts in Oceanica ad Pedes S. V. provolutus, quaedam dubia solvenda proponit circa validitatem duarum formarum Baptismatis, in lingua vernacula illarum insularum. Tota difficultas in eo sita est, quod cum lingua Gilbertana nullum verbum habeat ad exprimendam ideam sanctitatis, verbum aliquod accommodari debuit ad designandum Spiritum Sanctum in forma vernacula, qua utuntur catechistae, in collatione Baptismatis. In prima formula *Spiritus Sanctus* exprimitur per *Tamnei-ave-Navirvi*, literaliter *Spiritus Bonus.* In secunda vero per *Tamnei Tapu*, literaliter *Spiritus Sacer* seu potius *Sacratus.* Hisce positis quaeritur:

I. Quaenam ex his duabus formulis in futuro adhibenda erit a catechistis, in collatione Baptismatis?

II. Et quatenus invalidae reperiantur, an his formulis baptizati, rebaptizandi sint absolute aut sub conditione?

Feria IV, die 13 Aprilis 1904.

In Congregatione Generali S. R. et U. Inquisitionis coram EE.mis ac RR.mis DD. Cardinalibus Generalibus Inquisitoribus habita, propositis praedictis dubiis, praehabitoque RR. DD. Consultorum voto, iidem EE. ac RR. Patres respondendum mandarunt:

Ad I. *Baptizatos cum alterutra ex subiectis formulis non esse inquietandos.*

Ad II. *Catechistas rite instruendos esse ut, seposita quacumque altera formula, in collatione baptismatis sola utantur formula pag. 50* I papetitoiko n avan te Tama, ao te Rati, ao te Tamnei-ave-Navirvi—*in catechismo ipsis tradita, circa quam nihil innovetur. Missionari vero in collatione baptismi forma latina semper utantur, nunquam vernacula.*

Sequenti vero feria V, die 14 eiusdem mensis et anni, in solita audientia SS. D. N. Pii Div. Prov. Pp. X a R. P. D. Adsessore habita, SS.mus resolutionem EE. ac RR.Patrum adprobavit.

I. *Can.* MANCINI, *S. R. et U. Inquis. Not.*

II.

DISCRIMEN INTER PURUM MINISTERIUM PRO EXECUTIONE LITT. APL. ET DELEGATIONEM APL.CAM PRO CONCEDENDIS, NECNE, DISPENSATIONIBUS MATRIMONIALIBUS.[1]

Beatissimo Padre,

Il Vescovo di N., umilmente prostrato al Trono della S. V., espone che trovandosi privo da varii anni di Vicario Generale, sia per mancanza di soggetti idonei, sia per difetto di mezzi, nel tempo in cui era costretto assentarsi dalla Sede, delegò per la esecuzione delle dispense matrimoniali prima il suo Delegato diocesano, poi il Procuratore fiscale della Curia, con ordine di firmare gli atti *de speciali mandato.* Sortogli in seguito il dubbio della validità di tale delegazione e per conseguenza delle dispense accordate, domandò alla S. Penitenzieria se si sostenesse o no la validità di tali dispense, e la S. Penitenzieria gli rispose negativamente. Ciò posto desidererebbe conoscere, se una tale risposta non si opponga ad altra risoluzione emanata dal S. O. il 14 dicembre 1898.

[1] Aliquando agitur de aliquo casu particulari a S. Sede discusso et deciso, prouti est de dipensationibus concessis a S. Poenitentiaria vel Dataria, privatis personis, qui casus committitur Ordinario pro mera executione. Tunc habetur *purum ministerium* ex parte Ordinarii, qui alios subdelegare nequit.

Aliquando agitur de delegatione Ap.lica pro concedendis habitualiter dispensationibus matr. Tunc vera communicatur *iurisdictio* pro iudicandis singulis casibus, ad concedendam, vel non, dispensationem. Hoc in casu, Ordinarius subdelegare potest idoneos sacerdotes.

Feria IV, die 1 Iunii 1904.

In Congregatione Generali S. R. et U. Inquisitionis coram EE.mis ac RR.mis DD. Cardinalibus Generalibus Inquisitoribus habita, proposito praedicto dubio, praehabitoque RR. DD. Consultorum voto, iidem EE. ac RR. Patres respondendum mandarunt:

Praefatam responsionem S. Poenitentiariae haud opponi resolutioni fer. IV, 14 decembris 1898, illa enim respicit purum ministerium; haec veram et propriam dispensandi potestatem.

Sequenti vero feria V, die 2 eiusdem mensis et anni, in solita audientia SS. D. N. Pii Div. Prov. Pp. X a R. P. D. Adsessore habita, SS.mus resolutionem EE. ac RR. Patrum adprobavit.

I. *Can.* MANCINI, *S. R. et U. Inq. Not.*

E SACRA CONGREGATIONE RITUUM.

I.

FESTUM S. MARIAE DE CERVELLIONE, VULGO "DE SOCOS" PRO ORDINE DE MERCEDE EVEHITUR AD RITUM DUPL. PRIMAE CLASSIS.

Sanctissimus Dominus Noster Pius Papa X, clementer deferens supplicibus votis R.mi Patris Procuratoris Generalis Ordinis Redemptorum B. M. V. de Mercede, ab infrascripto Cardinali Sacrorum Rituum Congregationi Pro-Praefecto relatis, benigne indulgere dignatus est, ut festum S. Mariae de Cervellione, vulgo "de Socos" Virg., hucusque ritu duplici secundae classis cum Octava celebratum, tam a Patribus quam a Sanctimonialibus totius Ordinis de Mercede, quae ipsam Sanctam, Matrem ac Magistram suam venerantur, in posterum recoli valeat sub ritu duplici primae classis cum Octava: servatis Rubricis, Contrariis non obstantibus quibuscumque.

Die 22 Iunii 1904.

A. *Card.* TRIPEPI, *Pro-Praef.*

L. † S. † D. PANICI, *Archiep. Laodicen., Secret.*

II.

MISSA DE FESTO TRANSFERENDO.

R. D. Iosephus Fantoni, Sacerdos Archidioeceseos Utinen., de consensu sui R.mi Archiepiscopi, sequens dubium Sacrorum

Rituum Congregationi pro opportuna solutione humillime proposuit, nimirum :

In Paroecia Glemonae, Utinensis Dioeceseos, adest antiquissima consuetudo, ut Dominica prima Octobris, in solemnitate scilicet Sanctissimi Rosarii B. M. V., Archipresbyter Parochus cum suo Clero et populo conveniat ad Sacra solemniter peragenda in Ecclesia S. Antonii apud Fratres Minores, in qua exstat altare eidem Beatissimae Virgini sub titulo SS. Rosarii dicatum.

Cum vero interdum contingat ut solemnitas SS. Rosarii occurrat eadem die ac festum S. Francisci Assisiensis, quod sub ritu duplici primae classis cum Octava in omnibus Fratrum Minorum Ecclesiis celebratur, hinc quaeritur :

Utrum in occurrentia solemnitatis SS. Rosarii B. M. V. cum festo S. Francisci possit in praedicta Ecclesia S. Antonii, ratione concursus populi, cani Missa de festo transferendo, nempe de Rosario, iuxta Rubricas Generales Missalis, tit. VI ?

Et Sacra Rituum Congregatio, ad relationem subscripti Secretarii, exquisito etiam voto Commissionis Liturgicae, rescribendum censuit : "*Affirmative.*"

Atque ita rescripsit. Die 6 Maii 1904.

S. *Card.* CRETONI, *Praef.*

L. † S. † D. PANICI, *Archiep. Laodicen., Secret.*

III.

MISSA VOTIVA DE IMMACULATA B. M. V. CONCEPTIONE EXTENDITUR AD SINGULOS DIES TRIDUANAE VEL NOVENARIAE EIUSDEM FESTIVITATIS INSTITUENDAE.

Qui munus sibi demendatum, ad quinquagenaria a dogmatica definitione de Immaculato B. Mariae Virginis Conceptu solemnia provehenda, E.mi Patres Cardinales naviter et in exemplum exercent, recentia quaedam eaque communia quoque pluribus Sacrorum Antistitibus atque christifidelibus vota Sanctissimo Domino Nostro Pio Papae X humillime depromere e re esse existimarunt. Summus vero Pontifex, qui nihil magis in optatis habet quam novis sedulo argumentis Suum in Deiparam Sanctam primaevae labis nesciam amorem et obsequium testari, enixas preces, referente infrascripto Cardinali Sacrae Rituum Congregationi Pro-

Praefecto, nuper exhibitas perlibenter excepit. Et proinde Missam votivam de ipsamet Immaculata Conceptione qualibet die octava uniuscuiusque mensis vel Dominica sequenti una cum Eiusdem commemoratione, indultam per Decretum S. R. C. *Urbis et Orbis*, die 14 Augusti 1903, extendere dignatus est ad singulos dies triduanae vel novenariae festivitatis quae in quibusvis ecclesiis seu oratoriis, approbante loci Ordinario, in honorem Virginis Immaculatae intra hunc vel proximum annum instituetur, servatis tamen caeteris clausulis et conditionibus quae in memorato Decreto praescriptae sunt. Contrariis non obstantibus quibuscumque.

Die 22 Iunii 1904.

A. *Card.* TRIPEPI, *Pro-Praefectus.*

L. † S. † D. PANICI, *Archiep. Laodicen., Secret.*

IV.

SIMPLEX SACERDOS NEQUIT ECCLESIAM BENEDICTAM ET VIOLATAM RECONCILIARE ABSQUE ORDINARII SUI DELEGATIONE.

Rituale Romanum docet, Ecclesiam violatam, si sit consecrata, ab Episcopo; si vero benedicta tantum, a Sacerdote delegato ab Episcopo esse reconciliandam. Quum vero circa delegationem ab Episcopo obtinendam pro Ecclesia benedicta non sit unanimis Doctorum sententia, ad inordinationes praecavendas, hodiernus R.mus Episcopus Nolanus a S. Rituum Congregatione humiliter petiit: "Utrum simplex Sacerdos possit iure suo Ecclesiam benedictam, ubi violata fuerit, reconciliare sine ulla Ordinarii sui delegatione?"

Et Sacra eadem Congregatio, ad relationem subscripti Secretarii, exquisito etiam voto Commissionis Liturgicae, propositae quaestioni respondendum censuit: "*Negative*, et servetur Rituale Romanum, tit. VIII, cap. 28.

Atque ita rescripsit, die 8 Iulii 1904.

A. *Card.* TRIPEPI, *Pro-Praefectus.*

L. † S. † D. PANICI, *Archiep. Laodicen., Secret.*

Studies and Conferences.

OUR ANALECTA.

The Roman documents for the month are:

PONTIFICAL LETTER promulgating the canonical creation of the Archiepiscopal See of Oregon, and the foundation of the new Diocese of Baker City. The latter consists of the sixteen counties, Baker, Crook, Gilliam, Grant, Harney, Klamath, Lake, Malheur, Morrow, Sherman, Umatilla, Union, Wallowa, Wasco, Wheeler, and Stockman, with the episcopal residence at Baker City.

S. CONGREGATION OF INDULGENCES: 1. Answers a question concerning the obligatory nature of the recently published invocation, "*Most Sacred Heart of Jesus, have mercy on us,*" which was indulgenced by the Sovereign Pontiff with the understanding that it be recited in conclusion after the usual prayers alternately said by the celebrant and people at the end of private Masses. The reply is that although the invocation is not, strictly speaking, made obligatory, nevertheless the Holy Father greatly desires that for the sake of uniformity priests introduce this invocation among their people.

2. Announces an extension of the faculty exercised by the Ordinaries of Dioceses to grant certain indulgences to the faithful under their jurisdiction. By a Decree of Pius X the right of proclaiming indulgences is regulated as follows: Cardinals may grant 200 days indulgences to their titulars and diocesans; Archbishops 100 days, and Bishops 50 days within their dioceses.

S. CONGREGATION OF BISHOPS AND REGULARS:—1. Decides that there is no canonical obstacle to the election of two members related by blood, as Consultors of the same Regular Chapter in Religious Orders.

2. Obliges the Superiors of Religious Communities to allow their subjects the full right of obtaining an extraordinary confessor, under whatever plea these may ask the privilege. In cases where the Superior has grave reasons to believe that the demand

is injudicious and injurious to the interests of the individual or the Community, she is at liberty to place these reasons before the Ordinary and abide by his decision.

UNIVERSAL INQUISITION:—1. Decides that for private baptism, natives of the Gilbert Islands in the Pacific, whose language has no specific term to express the idea of "Holy Ghost," may use the words *Tamnei—ave—Navirvi*, signifying "Good Spirit"; but the priests are in all cases to use the Latin form.

2. Declares that a bishop who during his absence, having no vicar general, appointed a diocesan delegate to grant the dispensations usually accorded the Ordinary and vicar general by Apostolic Faculties, exceeded his rights; and the granted dispensations are invalid.

S. CONGREGATION OF RITES:—1. Raises the feast of Our Lady of Mercy from a *duplex II classis* to *duplex I classis* for all Communities of the Order of Mercy and those affiliated to the same under the title of *Ordo Redemptorum B. M. V. de Mercede*.

2. Allows the solemnity of the Holy Rosary to be liturgically celebrated on a Sunday in a Franciscan church where the Patronal Feast of the Order (St. Francis of Assissi) occurs on the same day as *duplex I classis*.

3. Extends the privilege of celebrating the votive Mass of the Immaculate Conception as a *duplex I classis* on each day of a triduum or novena in honor of the Immaculate Conception during the present *and next year*, under the same conditions as those attached to the privilege of saying the same votive Mass on the eighth day of each month during the present year.

4. Prohibits a simple priest without episcopal delegation from performing the rite of reconciling a church that has been violated.

WITHDRAWAL FROM NOMINAL MEMBERSHIP OF FORBIDDEN SOCIETIES.

Qu. Have Catholics who join the condemned Society of the "Odd Fellows," in which there is no insurance benefit, the right to seek permission to continue in the society, when it is ascertained that they joined in good faith or before the condemnation, and when the other conditions set forth by the Holy See with reference to societies having

insurance benefits, are verified? Or is the favor only for members of societies in which the insurance is a regular feature, since withdrawal would entail serious loss?

Resp. Catholics who have joined (whilst in good faith) societies which they afterwards find to be condemned by the Church are, it seems safe to say, entitled to apply in all cases the rule which obtains in the case of societies which declare *insurance forfeits* as the result of positive and nominal withdrawal from the society. Any contingency that entails a *damnum vere grave*, material or moral, would justify the application of the rules laid down by the Holy See permitting a passive retaining of membership. This presupposes, of course, that there does not result from the non-withdrawal either evident scandal, or effects which are equivalent to active coöperation, or open moral support of a known bad cause.

THE NUPTIAL MASS FOR CONVERTS MARRIED OUTSIDE THE CHURCH.

Qu. John and Mary are married. When they married, John was a non-Catholic. Ten years later he enters the Catholic Church, and then he and Mary wish to receive the nuptial blessing. The question is: May the *Missa pro sponso et sponsa* be said for them just as if it were the day of their marriage? *i. e.*, has this event the same privileges? Or if the feast of that day happens to be a *duplex*, should the Mass of the feast be said and the blessing given according to the rubrics? Some think such an occasion has all the privileges of the marriage day; others hold that the *Missa pro sponso et sponsa*, like funeral Masses, loses its privilege when the day of the function to which it was originally attached has passed, in such wise that the Mass may be said only on a day that admits of a votive Mass.

Resp. In regard to the celebration of the Nuptial Ceremony, the Holy See has laid down the principle that the Blessing is to be performed whenever Catholics desire it, provided they have not received it before, *whatever may have been the reason* ("qui eam *quacumque ex causa* non obtinuerint"). Since the Blessing may not be separated at will from the *Missa pro sponsis*, it follows that the Mass is to be said whenever the rubrics permit it, *i. e.*, on all days except Sundays, holidays of obligation, and such feasts or

festivals as exclude *doubles minor* and *major*. On these latter days the Mass of the day is said with the commemoration, etc., as otherwise in nuptial functions. All this, of course, applies to the *tempus non clausum*, when nuptial Masses of any kind are not prohibited.

CANONS AND CELEBRANTS.

Qu. May I call your attention to page 493 of the November issue of THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW. It seems to me that there is a misinterpretation of the decree given at page 489, regarding priests genuflecting on one or both knees. In the second question it is asked if the same mode is to be observed. This same mode cannot refer to the first question but to its answer, because there are two modes mentioned in the first question. Therefore it must refer to the answer, and so the meaning will be: Is the decision you give for canons to hold also for priests passing? etc., and the answer is: No, the rubrics must be observed as in the Missal. The rubric does not speak of the whole time between the Elevation and Communion, but says one must remain kneeling while Communion is being given. The S. Congregation of Rites, August 7, 1698, says one need not remain kneeling, but may rise and go on. In Gavant there is authorization for genuflecting on both knees, and the direction in Martinucci is very clear. In Vol. I, Ch. XVIII, n. 20, it is said a priest must kneel on both knees, take off his biretta, adore the Blessed Sacrament, put on the biretta, rise, and go on. This, I suggest, is the true meaning of the decision and not the one given at page 493 of the November number of the REVIEW.

Birmingham, England. DANIEL ILES.

Resp. The distinction which Canon Iles makes, is correct. At the same time it does not appear to affect our summary statement, which is in this case, as always, made with a practical view of directing the attention to what is to be the actual observance resulting from the decision given in our *Analecta*. The S. Congregation in the present instance notes the question whether canons should genuflect on both knees or on one, when passing an altar where Mass is being celebrated, that is, during the interval between the Consecration and Communion. The answer of the S. Congregation, as also of the Rubrics of the Missal, is: on one

knee only. The next question proposed to the Congregation is whether priests passing an altar under like conditions are to do the same as canons. The answer is: they are to observe the rubrics given in the Missal. The distinction of the two replies is characteristic and in perfect accord with the custom of the Roman Congregation, which invariably answers questions in the tenor in which they are asked, and never answers questions implied but not expressly asked. It points out what is the rule for canons in the case, because canons are not mentioned in the rubrics of the Missal; but it does not follow from this that the rule for canons is in such cases different from that of any other priest celebrating. Then next the question is asked: what are other priests to do under like circumstances? The S. Congregation simply refers the inquirer to the rubrics of the Missal where the rule is laid down for such. There was no reason for assuming that canons should do differently from others; but since the S. Congregation was asked about them in particular, it answers about them in particular, instead of saying: canons should do in this matter as other priests do,—which is really what is meant by the decision. Hence the priest who goes to celebrate Mass, in passing an altar where another Mass is going on, between the time of Consecration and Communion, genuflects on one knee, whether he be a canon or anything more or less (unless there be question of a solemn function in which priests go processionally; and even then priests are to do nothing in passing an altar that canons would not be equally bound to do). And this was what was said at page 493 referred to above.

BLESSED FRANCIS GONZAGA.

The good news is published in the official acts of the Franciscan Order that the S. Congregation of Rites has resumed the process of Beatification of P. Francesco Gonzaga, the man to whom St. Aloysius owed perhaps above all others the realization of his wish to become a Jesuit, when the opposition of the family threatened to frustrate the Divine call and to deprive the Church of so fair a Saint. Francis Gonzaga had been, before his entrance into the Franciscan Order, attached to the Court of Charles V of Spain, and at the age of eleven, as page elect, accompanied the

special embassy of the Emperor to Alessandro Farnese in Flanders. A few year later, he was deputed as escort to Philip of Spain, son of Charles, for the royal coronation ceremony, to Brussels. That same year, however, he renounced the pleasures and honors of the court, and being scarcely eighteen years of age, entered the novitiate of the Friars Minor at Alcala. He became an eminent theologian, and in 1579, at the age of thirty-three, was elected General of the entire Franciscan Order. It was on his return from a visitation of the Minorite communities in Spain, that he took the young son of Count Ferrante Gonzaga of Castiglione, with him to Italy. Aloysius Gonzaga was then about eighteen years old. A few months later, after Aloysius had entered the novitiate of the Jesuits, P. Francesco came to Don Ferrante who was on his deathbed at Milan, and moved him fully to second the sacrifice which his beloved boy had made in leaving behind him the prospects of a military and courtly career in order to assume the black gown of the militia of Christ.

When the archiepiscopal see of Milan had been left vacant by the death of St. Charles Borromeo, the Pope nominated P. Francesco Gonzaga as his successor, but the latter declined to accept the dignity, as he deemed himself unworthy and incapable of sustaining the work begun by the saintly Archbishop. Later on, he was prevailed upon to assume the difficult post of Bishop to the see of Cefalù in Sicily. Here he laid the foundations of the first ecclesiastical seminary on the model prescribed by the Council of Trent. He was relentless in enforcing the reforms sanctioned by the decrees of the Council, and effectually resisted the political intriguers who, in the name of the King, sought to maintain certain abuses among the clergy under the title of ecclesiastical prerogatives, which they found to their temporal advantage. On one occasion, when an officer of high degree pleaded his past loyalty to the King as an excuse for refusing to recognize the ordinances of the Bishop, the latter answered: "You speak of loyalty to the King, as though the Bishop had no such sentiments. Let me remind you, sir, that the Gonzagas have shed a greater quantity of blood in defence of the King than you have consumed wine during your lifetime, which I think cannot be little."

Later, P. Francesco was nominated Bishop of Pavia; but, at the urgent instance of the Duke of Mantua, he was appointed to the see of the ducal city, where he also founded a seminary, and enforced the reforms of the Council. To his efforts were largely due the Beatification of his holy young relative, Aloysius, which occurred within fifteen years after the death of the youthful Saint. The final canonization was not effected until a hundred and twenty years later. There is a biography of P. Francesco Gonzaga from the pen of Donesmondi, published in Venice, 1625. The body of the Venerable Francesco Gonzaga is preserved in the Cathedral of Mantua; the figure of the Bishop is there seen sitting upon the episcopal throne erected in the vault under the high altar.

RABATS AND TUFTS.

Qu. On page 607 of your December number I find the word *rabat* applied to a Roman collar, and the word *soprana* used for *soprano*. The *rabat* is the band which the clergy wear in France, and which the Christian Brothers wear here. It has generally been regarded among the clergy as a symbol of Gallicanism, as the Roman collar stands for Ultramontanism, so that they designate two absolutely different things. The word *rabat* is vulgarized into "rabbi."

As regards the position of Apostolic Protonotaries, it is to be observed that certain privileges have been granted them recently, such as wearing a red tuft on their birettas, and, by delegation of the Ordinary, saying low Mass on solemn occasions *more episcopali* with assistant priest, bugia, four lights, and two servers. The text of this concession is found in the *Acta Pontificia* for April, 1904, pp. 454 and 455.

Resp. The word *rabat* is, we think, properly used for the collar of the Roman clergy. In fact, the word as found both in Middle English, and French, or Italian, suggests simply a turn-down collar of any kind, but especially the broad lap-over linen kerchief used by the Southern Cavaliers and by the clergy indiscriminately. Its use, therefore, antedates by centuries the distinction of "Gallican" and "Ultramontane," which can no more undo the original sense of the word than the use of the word "stocks" by bankers can undo the meaning of stocks applied to Roman collar bands.

As regards *soprana*, it is the only term for the thing we meant to designate by the name, and is so accepted by the clergy of Rome and Italy generally. We know of soprano singers, but not of *soprano* garments.

The privileges referred to, as allowed to Apostolic Protonotaries on special occasions, were explicitly mentioned in our article on Protonotaries in the November number, where they belonged, page 451.

CAPES ON CASSOCKS.

Qu. According to a statement which I see in the *Catholic Universe* (Cleveland), the wearing of the soutane with cape by the parish clergy is not reserved to rectors of churches, but may be assumed by curates exercising parochial or quasi-parochial authority. The writer bases his statement upon the universal custom of the parish clergy in Rome, which he says is a good guide to follow. Is this correct?

Resp. The cassock with cape, known in Italy as the *simarra* (French *simarre*), is not worn by the Roman parish clergy except as an out-door dress, when it serves the purpose of a light overcoat.

This garment, however, is quite distinct from the *simarra* or soutane with short cape ordinarily worn by canonical parish priests or irremovable rectors of churches in Rome and elsewhere throughout Europe. The latter is, according to Barbier de Montault in his exhaustive work on clerical costumes and customs (*Le costume selon la tradition Romaine*, p. 88), a distinctive mark of regular jurisdiction, and as such takes the place of the common cassock. Accordingly it is worn by Vicars General, Irremovable Rectors, and Rectors of Seminaries.[1] The same authority says that it is an abuse for parish priests who are not irremovable to adopt this privilege. As Mgr. Montault studied his subject at first sources, and took account of the ancient and existing Roman traditions, it is plain that the above-mentioned

[1] "La simarre remplace la soutane et elle est un signe distinctif qui se refère à la jurisdiction ordinaire . . . La simarre noire est propre aux vicaires généraux, aux curés inamovibles et aux recteurs des seminaires." (*Le Costume et les Usages ecclesiastiques selon la tradition Romaine*, par Mgr. X. Barbier de Montault, prélat de la Maison de Sa Sainteté.)

appeal in the *Catholic Universe* to a universal Roman custom is an error. The writer mistakes the out-door *simarra* (which of course anybody might wear) for the ordinary cassock with cape allowed only to permanent rectors and dignitaries or officials of the diocese, to whom it is conceded by the Ordinary or, in view of vicarious jurisdiction, by Rome.

It may be added that, since nearly all parishes in Rome, under the canonical law, have the privilege of irremovable rectorships attached to them, whilst with us such rectorships are limited, the privilege of wearing a cossack with cape would seem to be applicable in general to rectors of churches which are considered *quasi* permanent incumbencies. Assistant priests who have no ordinary jurisdiction independent of the parish rector, unless they hold some canonical office which entitles them to the distinction, would seem to have no right to the cape.

THE UNIFORM PRONUNCIATION OF LATIN.

We have on different occasions shown why the pronunciation of Latin adopted by common consent among the Romans of today has, as the living official language of the Roman clergy throughout the world, the right of way over all other variations of pronunciation adopted in the schools, unless we study Latin for the purpose merely of reviving the classical or archaic models of the Augustan period.

The lack of uniformity amongst us in this respect is perhaps excusable in view of the promiscuous elements whence the teaching bodies in Catholic colleges and seminaries are frequently supplied; nevertheless it is a disadvantage which could be eliminated, were the ecclesiastical authorities to interest themselves in the matter by giving harmonious direction to our teaching methods. It is not a matter of curtailing the privileges of teachers or of overriding cherished prejudices. We all realize that if Rome speaks to us in Latin and we are to speak to Romans in the same language, it behooves us to adopt a pronunciation readily understood by all. That this fact is being realized by the Hierarchy of Ireland is evident from a resolution passed at the General Conference of Archbishops and Bishops held at Maynooth, wherein

it was proposed that the Roman pronunciation of Latin be as far as possible generally adopted in the ecclesiastical seminaries and colleges of the land.

The question, what this Roman pronunciation is in detail, is answered by the Assistant Bishop of Dublin, Dr. Donnelly, in a clear grammatical summary[1] which we take the liberty of reproducing here. In regard to the pronunciation of the *h* in the middle of words, which Dr. Donnelly gives as somewhat like *ch* or *k*, it might be suggested that this is not the pronunciation of cultured Italians who make a point of enunciating accurately. The habit is common enough, like that other of adding a mute *e* to words ending in a consonant, as *Dominusĕ* for *Dominus*. Here may be applied what Cicero says of the pronunciation of this same letter *h* in his own day,—"usum loquendi populo concessi, scientiam mihi reservavi."

Following are the rules of the pronunciation of Latin, according to the living usage of the Roman clergy, formulated for the guidance of students by Dr. Donnelly:—

General Vowels.

Vowels.

A. This vowel is pronounced as *a* in *far*, *e.g.*, *cá-put*, *má-nus*, etc.

E is pronounced as *ay* in *say*, never as *ee* in *bee*. Care must be taken, however, especially in singing, not to add another vowel to the *e*, as sometimes we hear Ky-ri-e-i, Misereire.

I always and under all circumstances should be sounded as *ee* in *bee*; never and under no circumstances as the English personal pronoun "I." This is one of the vowels most sinned against in English-speaking countries. Outside of the latter such a pronunciation is never heard.

O is pronounced substantially as we have been accustomed to pronounce it hitherto.

U. This is the vowel which needs most attention. In English we make a diphthong of it and speak of it as *yoo*. In Latin it is a simple vowel, and whether in the beginning, middle, or end of words should be sounded as *oo* in *coo*, *moon*, etc. Hence *ut* = *oot*,

[1] *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, December, 1904, p. 533.

not *ut* as in the English word utter; *u-trúmque* = *oo-tróom-que*, *mi-ssus* = *mi-ssoos*, *sénsu* = *sé-nsoo*; *se-nsoo-oom de-fe-ctoo-ee* it should be in the *Tantum Ergo*.

One mispronunciation of this vowel when preceded by the letter *t* constantly occurs amongst us, though it rather affects the *t* than the *u*. Why, for instance, do we pronounce *tuus* or *tuum*, as if they were written *tch-úus* or *tch-úum?* The correct reading is *too-oos*, *too-oom*. This malpractice is especially objectionable when it is sung in the response to *Dominus vobiscum*.

J is considered as a vowel or kind of prolonged or double *i*. In the beginning or middle of a word it is pronounced as *y* in the words *yield*, *year*, *young*. Hence the Holy Name Jesus is pronounced *Yá-ysoos*; *é-jus* = *áy-yoos*, *cú-jus* = *cóo-yoos*, etc.

Diphthongs.

In Italian there are, properly speaking, no diphthongs; in Latin *two* are recognized—

AE, OE, both pronounced alike, as *ay* in *say*; thus *sáepe* = *sáy-pay*, *moeróre* = *ma-yró-ray*.

EI is never a diphthong, each vowel must be sounded separately, consequently *é-i* = *á-yee*, *méi* = *má-yee*, and never *I* or *my*.

Similarly in **AU**, the two vowels are separately but rather quickly spoken, like *ou* in *loud*.

EU the two vowels are separately sounded. Thus in the word *éuge*, the pronunciation is *é-oo-ge*.

N.B.—A vowel at the end of a word is always pronounced as a distinct syllable, and every vowel preserves its proper sound independently of the consonants which accompany it.

Consonants.

C. The Roman pronunciation of this consonant in Latin is distinctively Italian, though some try to give it a classic pedigree. Hitherto we have been accustomed to sound it, when it comes before certain vowels, as *s*; thus we say *say*lum, for coelum; *si*vitas, for civitas, etc. Now, it is a consonant distinct from *s*, and is entitled to its own proper sound. The Romans never sound it as *s*, but before the vowels *e*, *i*, *y*, *ae*, *oe*, it is pronounced as *ch* in *child*, *chess*, *chief*, consequently *ceperunt* = *chepéroont*, *civitas* =

cheeveetas, cygnus = cheeynoos, caetera = chaytera, coelum = chay-loom.

Followed by *a, o, u,* it is pronounced like *k* or *ch* hard, thus *caput = kaput, codex = kodex, cupio = koopio.*

H in the beginning of words is pronounced as in English, in the middle of words somewhat as *ch* hard or *k ;* thus *nihil = nichil* or *nikil.*

Double Consonants.

CC. Where they precede *e* or *i* they are pronounced as *ch* in the word *achieve ;* that is, the first *c* is pronounced like *t,* the latter retaining its ordinary sound, thus *accedere = at-che-dere.*

CH, before *e* or *i,* are pronounced like *k* or *ch* in the English word *chemist,* e. g., *Chersonesum = Ker-so-ne-sum.*

GN, in the syllabes *gna, gne, gni, gno, gnu,* have a liquid sound similar to that of *ni* is such words as dom*i*nion, p*i*nion, o*n*ion ; consequently *Agnus Dei* becomes *A-nyoos* Dei, *pignore pi-nyore.*

SC. Before *e* or *i* they sound like *sh* in *shape* or *ship ;* thus *sceptrum = she-ptroom, scire = shee-re.* Followed by *a, o, u,* they are pronounced as *sk ;* thus *scandalum = ska-nd-aloom.*

There remains only the oft-disputed word *excelsis. Eggshells,* as a phonetic equivalent for the two first syllables, is to be rejected, equally so *ex-chel ; ekshelsis* seems to be the nearest approach to the Roman sound.

"The adoption of the Roman pronunciation of Latin," writes the Bishop, "now ordered for all colleges and seminaries by the Archbishops and Bishops of Ireland, besides bringing us into line with the pronunciation actually prevailing in most Catholic countries,[1] has the additional important advantage, that when visiting Rome, whether for business, study, or pleasure, we shall be enabled to enter into familiar oral intercourse with people there, and not be condemned to silence, as hitherto, by employing a pronunciation which rendered us unintelligible, however our phrases might be otherwise grammatically or rhetorically correct."

[1] Even France, in many instances, has adopted it.

Ecclesiastical Library Table.

RECENT BIBLE STUDY.

1. Introduction.—Most recent writers become so hazy when they treat of inspiration, that they leave the reader quite uncertain as to the real nature of the subject. Thus Mr. Gilmour, of Mongolia, finds the difference between the Bible and any other book in the fact that the Bible "sets toward God." Professor Wendt, of Jena, finds the essence of the Bible in the revelation it contains. A writer in the *Expository Times*[1] expresses the foregoing views in a somewhat different way: "In the Bible, Mr. Gilmour seems to say, man gets at God; Professor Wendt says that in the Bible God gets at man."

Our fathers found the revelation of the Bible in its supernatural inspiration. At the invitation of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association Professor Wendt delivered a lecture on the revelation to be found in the Bible.[2] He denied that the Bible is inspired; but he found in it the revelation through Christ. God was in Christ revealing Himself as He is in you and in me. The religion of the Bible is not to be distinguished from every other religion. We find the revelation of God in Christ simply because "we find in other men and in ourselves a higher life and higher powers analogous to what we have in Him."[3] The revelation to Christ was greater than to other men, because Christ was the first to preach the Fatherhood of God, everlasting life, the duty of a childlike trust, and the love of man for man.

Besides, the life of Jesus was itself a revelation. In order to lead a life so unselfish and loving, He needed to be supported by a supramundane power. It is supramundane, because it is a power which comes from God. But in all this Professor Wendt has not explained Christ, he has not told us why Jesus possessed that extraordinary power, why God's revelation attained in Jesus its culminating point, why he himself does not preach and live as Jesus did, although he recognizes the revelation as it is in Jesus by the testimony of his own conscience.

[1] November, 1904, p 49.

[2] The Idea and Reality of Revelation, Philip Green, 1s. 6d.

[3] *Ibid.*

The Septuagint has been reëdited in English by Mr. Pells, and Mr. St. John Thackeray has published a book on the *Letter of Aristeas*, in which he contributes to the study of Hellenistic-Hebraism. F. E. König's monumental Hebrew grammar is not a recent work, in the sense that it has been published during the course of the year 1904.[4] In fact, sixteen years intervened between the appearance of the first volume and that of the third. But the work deserves a repeated notice, since it not merely utilizes the works of Gesenius, Ewald, and Olshausen, but advances beyond them.—The second edition of Nöldeke's *Compendious Syriac Grammar* has been translated into English by Dr. James A. Crichton.[5] The work is classical in its own line. A writer of note does not hesitate to say: "those who do not know that Nöldeke's Grammar is the grammar of the Syriac tongue do not know anything about Syriac."—During the past year Dr. Jastrow has completed his *Dictionary of the Talmud.* This work, together with Professor Strack's *Einleitung in den Talmud*,[6] will be a valuable aid to all *Talmud* students. The latter work belongs to the series known as the *Schriften des Institutum judæicum in Berlin.*—Those who read the Hebrew text of the Old Testament will be aided in their interpretation by Kennedy's book on the *Note-Line Paseq.*

Some years ago, Father Gigot published a *General Introduction* to the Holy Scriptures; the author now offers us an abridgment of the work, intended for the use of students who are pursuing their theological studies, and for whom, because of the limited time at their disposal, the larger work is not available.[7] —An anonymous work, containing all the introductory treatises together with Biblical geography and archæology has been successful enough to reach its fifth edition.[8] This is the more remarkable because anonymous works are usually predestined to perish. The book gives copious bibliographical references, and does not merely state results, but indicates also the way that has led or does lead to them. It thus enables the student to do independent work of a more advanced character.

[4] Historisch-kritisches Lehrgebäude der hebräischen Sprache, Leipzig, Hinrichs; 3 vols., 50 Mk.

[5] Williams and Norgate, 18*s*. [6] Third Edition, Leipzig, Hinrichs.

[7] General Introduction to the Study of the Holy Scriptures; Abridged Edition; New York, 1904, Benziger Brothers.

[8] Einführung in die Heilige Schrift; Regensburg, 1904.

Dr. Bonaccorsi has published a little work, entitled *Questioni Bibliche*.[9] It contains three theological studies; one on the Vulgate at the Council of Trent, one on the Historical Value of the Hexateuch, and a third on the Catholic Doctrine concerning the Interpretation of Scripture. The third is new, the other two appeared in the year 1902, the first in the *Scuola Cattolica*, of Milan, the second in the *Studii religiosi* of Florence. In the first, the author holds with Vercellone against Cardinal Franzelin that the Tridentine decree concerning the Vulgate is not dogmatic, but disciplinary. He appeals to the testimony of Vega, Bellarmine, Tiletanus, and others. In his second study, Dr. Bonaccorsi endeavors to establish that the writers in Israel did not differ from the writers outside the race of Israel in their method of writing history. And if their natural disposition inclined them to this method of reporting traditions rather than of writing history in the modern sense of the word, the Holy Spirit would, no doubt, impel them to write according to their natural disposition. This theory naturally leads to what some students call "the relative truthfulness" of Sacred Scripture. Those who wish to realize the full danger of this theory in its unmitigated form should consult Father Billot's recent work, *De Sacra Traditione*.[10] Finally, in his third study Dr. Bonaccorsi appears to follow in a modified way the theory advocated by Father Nisius and explained in these pages at the time of the appearance of the articles in question. He seems to maintain that only those truths fall under the positive interpretative rights of the Church that are contained in the *Depositum fidei*. And which truths does he consider to be contained in the *Depositum?* (1) Those that are revealed as well as inspired; (2) those merely inspired truths, so intimately connected with the truths revealed as well as inspired, that, without reference to the former, the latter cannot be effectually vindicated. We need not say that Bonaccorsi's theory has raised a good deal of adverse criticism. Unless the limits of the Church's positive and negative interpretation be clearly explained and constantly kept in view, the foregoing theory is apt to interfere with Rome's authority over the whole Bible.

[9] Bologna, Tipographia Pontificia Mareggiana.

[10] De Sacra Traditione contra novam hæresim Evolutionismi; Rome, 1904.

2. The Whole Bible.—The Abbé Crampon had prepared a new translation of all the canonical books of Sacred Scripture, and had collected a great number of exegetical and critical notes intended for an accompanying commentary. The books of the Pentateuch had been printed, when death interrupted the hard work of the indefatigable student. The editors therefore applied to certain Fathers of the Society of Jesus to complete the unfinished work. The latter revised and partially recast both translation and notes, and at length published their part of the work in six volumes.[10] This is the large edition of the work, which has grown in favor ever since the appearance of its first volume. But it is too large to serve for class work. Hence the Rev. Directors of clerical students asked the editors for a *Manual Edition* of the seven volumes, and several Sulpician Fathers offered the service of their knowledge and experience in order to render the compendious edition as valuable as possible. It contains (1) the French translation from the original texts of the Old and the New Testament, together with a typographical indication of the parallelism found in the books of Job, the Psalms, etc.; (2) notes abridged for the most part from the notes of the larger edition, remarks concerning the primitive texts, comparisons of the ancient versions with the original texts, and fuller explanations of those portions that are unintelligible without a brief commentary.[11] It is true that this small edition does not pretend to give the latest results of criticism; but this is no loss. The so-called results are mostly so uncertain that it is preferable not to popularize them. The reader really interested in what the Bible is as to its literary form, and what it has to say, will find the *Manual Edition* a treasure-house of information.

Probably most of our readers are acquainted with Angus's *Bible Handbook*. It has had a long and an honorable career, but its career appears to be run now. Dr. Green therefore has prepared a new edition of the book. Dr. Green might have written a *Handbook* of his own; it would have been easier to do so, and

[10] La Sainte Bible traduite en français sur les textes originaux, avec introductions et notes et la Vulgate latine en regard; Paris, Rome, Tournai: Desclée, Lefebvre et Cie. 1894—1904. 7 vols. 8vo.

[11] La Sainte Bible. Traduction d'après les textes originaux par l'abbé A. Crampon. Edition revisée par des Pères de la Cie. de Jésus avec la collaboration de Professeurs de S. Sulpice; Paris, Rome, Tournai: Desclée, Lefebvre et Cie. 1904.

it would have been less humble. But he has chosen the harder and lowlier task, and he has done it well.[12] Not as if we were willing to subscribe to all it contains, to swallow every sentence and every word of it. A Catholic can hardly be expected to do this in case of a non-Catholic book. But the revision is carried out in a progressive-conservative spirit.—Our advanced critics have caused trouble not only at home, among Christian nations, but they have rendered the life of the Christian missionary more toilsome. In India, *e. g.*, the enemies of the Cross heard of Professor Cheyne's Jerahmeel theory, they found his book, and came with it to the missionary. The latter had probably never heard of the far-famed Jerahmeel, and much less did he know that critical scholarship rejects Jerahmeel. What can he do under these circumstances? Let him buy Dr. R. F. Horton's new work which is especially prepared to meet his needs.[13] The author is fully convinced that the truth of God lies along the lines of the higher criticism; but he draws the line at Jerahmeel. He admits the historical and believing criticism; he rejects the unhistorical and unbelieving.—A Catholic Missionary has published a book on the Bible which will prove more useful to the man engaged in the active duties of the apostolate than the foregoing. Its title is *La Bible meditée d'après les Pères.*[14] The author, the Abbé Étienne Chargeboeuf, is himself a member of the *Foreign Missions.* He endeavors to make the lonely missionary appreciate the flowers of the land that flows with milk and honey. The land embraces mainly the historical books of the Old Testament; the flowers are the allegorical interpretations of the Fathers.

3. The Old Testament.—Professor Kent, of Yale University, has begun the publication of a series to be known as *The Student's Old Testament.*[15] The first volume carries the narratives from the Creation down to the establishment of the Hebrew kingdom. It endeavors to be an interesting and popular book. Whatever is of less general interest, has been relegated into an appendix. The author's aim is to separate the Old Testament into its sources, and

[12] The Bible Handbook. By the late Joseph Angus. Revised by Samuel G. Green, D.D. Religious Tract Society.

[13] The Bible a Missionary Book; Oliphant. [14] Paris, Desclée.

[15] The Student's Old Testament. Vol. I. Narratives of the Beginnings of Hebrew History.

present them side by side, each in a continuous narrative so far as it goes. The translation is the author's own, done directly from the Hebrew, with the aid of all kinds of versions, ancient and modern. There is a good introduction, and besides we have maps and charts, and numerous footnotes to direct us.—The "International Theological Library" has received two additional volumes that must be mentioned here: H. P. Smith's *Old Testament History* and the late Prof. A. B. Davidson's *Old Testament Theology*. Our readers are sufficiently well acquainted both with the two series of publications and the two authors to judge of the value of the works.

The Book of Genesis has been explained anew by Prof. S. R. Driver in the "Westminster Commentary" series, and by Professor Bennett in the Century Bible.—The Church Printing Company too has published a first volume of a series entitled *The Book of Genesis treated as an Authentic Record.*

The book is described as an extremely ugly and laborious one, and as containing the Adamic and Noachic narratives. The author is not in line with the present-day methods of Bible study, so that we fear for the success of his work.—The "Biblical Illustrator" has issued a new volume, *Deuteronomy*,[16] which may be said to be the cheapest book of the season. It is the cheapest for quantity; the purchaser gets 602,880 words for *7s. 6d.* It is cheapest for quality too; it contains all the cleverest things which all the cleverest men of the last fifty years have written about Deuteronomy.—The Rev. John Urquhart has published a work entitled *How Old is Man?*[17] He deliberately sets to work to demonstrate the utter untrustworthiness of the accepted chronology of the Bible. "The old chronology must be discarded," we are told in so many words. The reader will be no little astonished and perplexed; let us hope that his faith will not suffer.

Mr. Charles Bickersteth Wheeler has an article in the last number of the *Hibbert Journal* on "The Ten Commandments." Mr. Wheeler divides the Commandments into three parts, not into two tables. The Fourth Commandment constitutes a division by itself, seeing that for the ancient Hebrew his parents held a place near to that of God. Then the writer passes on to a review

[16] Griffiths. [17] Messrs. Nisbet. *2s. 6d.*

of the single Commandments. The First Commandment is said to have no meaning for us. The Second Commandment, *i. e.*, the second part of our First Commandment, shocks Mr. Wheeler by its downright silliness: no one would think that the image was a god; the image would rather assist the devotion of the worshipper; and jealousy on the part of God would argue want of self-respect. The Third Commandment, our Second, is not very objectionable; still, the author thinks "that life would be a little uninteresting did no one ever use" expletives. Mr. Wheeler is delighted with the Fourth Commandment, *i. e.*, our Third. He wants his weekly day of rest; but he objects to have any authority tell him how to take it. The Fifth Commandment, our Fourth, appears to Mr. Wheeler to imply a certain amount of meanness. It actually holds out a bribe. Let each one leave his respect and affection to find their natural level regardless of relationship or any such tie. Coming to the Commandment "Thou shalt not steal," Mr. Wheeler appears to abrogate the ten. Men would not annex a square of their neighbor's land, but they think little of taking a slice off the common if they can do it undetected. And then Mr. Wheeler has no use for the Commandment "Thou shalt not commit adultery." He says, if you do commit adultery, you should have good reasons for it, and be prepared to face the consequences. "Thou shalt not kill" is too short a Commandment. The gloss "in a private capacity" is joyfully admitted by all. We recite the Ten Commandments in leading the murderer to execution, and as we go to war. In case of the Commandment, "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor" Mr. Wheeler objects to the restriction "against thy neighbor." Most people, he says, tell more lies about themselves than about their neighbor. They act on the principle of the young lady in the play, that "it is better to lie a little than to suffer much." Finally, Mr. Wheeler cannot see why the great Legislator should have stopped short at covetousness when he treated of the sins of thought. What has been said sufficiently illustrates Mr. Wheeler's supercilious arrogance to aid the reader in forming his opinion of the would-be critic. Professor Kautzsch comes to a far different conclusion as to the value of the Ten Commandments.[18] "It [the Decalogue] remains a religious document which has a good title to be regarded, even by

[18] Dict. of the Bible, vol. v, p. 634b.

the Christian Church at the present day, as a kind of *Magna Charta* for the guidance of the religious life."

Mr. Edward M. Merrins, M.D., has contributed to the *Bibliotheca Sacra* for October a study on Saul's sickness. No doubt, much has been said and written about this subject; but new investigations are welcome nevertheless. The writer tells us at once that Saul was subject to epilepsy. There are three kinds of epilepsy: (1) the unconsciousness is profound and prolonged, and the convulsions are general and violent; (2) the unconsciousness may be momentary, and the convulsions may be slight or altogether absent; (3) in psychical epilepsy mental and emotional disturbances appear in the intercalary periods, entirely independent of the convulsions. Dr. Merrins believes that Saul was subject to psychical epilepsy.

Dr. Charles Salmond has written a Bible-class primer on *Eli, Samuel and Saul*,[19] in order to render accessible the Books of Samuel[20] to the ordinary classes. Even Dr. Salmond has found his task difficult, but he has given his whole strength to it, and mastered the difficulties for himself at least.—Mr. R. R. Ottley has published *The Book of Isaiah according to the Septuagint*.[21] Many a scholar would have liked to do this, had he been possessed of the necessary courage and scholarship. The translation of the Hebrew text is set face to face with that of the Septuagint. We can thus discover at a glance where the texts differ and where they agree.—The Psalms have claimed the attention of a great many students during the course of the last few months. The *Expository Times*[22] publishes a lecture "On the Translation and Use of the Psalms for Public Worship of the Church," delivered by the late Professor Robertson Smith in Aberdeen Free Church College. Dr. Kaufman Kohler has published a new translation of the Psalms under the auspices of the American Jewish Publication Society. Other works on the same topic are: C. Evans' *Notes on the Psalter;* Professor T. K. Cheyne's *Commentary;* Mr. Thirtle's *Titles of the Psalms;* Dr. King's *Triennial Cycle;* and Mr. Prothero's *Psalms in Human Life*.

[19] T. & T. Clarke, 6*d*.
[20] I & II Kings.
[21] Cambridge University Press, 5*s*.
[22] Nov., p. 58 ff.

Criticisms and Notes.

CONCILLII TRIDENTINI ACTORUM PARS PRIMA: Monumenta Concilium praecedentia, trium priorum sessionum acta. Collegit, edidit, illustravit Stephanus Ehses. Friburgi Brisgoviae: B. Herder. St. Louis, Mo. 1904. Pp. cxli—618.

The "Goerres" Society, whose membership comprises the best intellectual and literary element of the Catholic clergy and laity in Germany, and which has its regular archivists in the historical sections of the Vatican library, has sedulously continued its undertaking to procure a new and typical edition of the Acts of the Council of Trent. The collection, begun several years ago, embraces not only the Acts and Decrees, but likewise the Journals, Epistles, and Tracts which were preparatory and incident to the great Synod. We have already spoken in praise of the work on occasion of the appearance of former volumes and have only to emphasize, in regard to this fourth volume which leads us into the first three sessions of the Council, what has been said about the great importance of the undertaking as an aid to the contemplated codification of the entire Canon Law.

The text here followed by Dr. Ehses is that of Massarelli, the Secretary of the Council, and embodies the versions of the Vatican and Barbarini codices. These were afterwards collated with the edition by Theiner, which comparison became subject to a further scrutiny by a separate study of the correspondence of Cardinal Campegio, and the Bulls and Briefs which preceded and led up to the convocation of the Council.

The Introduction, which covers 141 pages, reviews the origin of the Council, and gives us a sketch of the different national and ecclesiastical elements which brought about the immediate activity aiming at a reform in the legislative and executive organism of the Church. Of the six-hundred quarto pages which follow the historical introduction less than seventy are occupied with the transactions of the Council proper, and even these concern rather the opening orations held in the first three sessions in which the Congregations met for the purpose of conferring on methods of immediate procedure, on nominations and divisions of the acting chapters, and on the settlement of differences concerning the proposed order of discussions. Thus, whilst all

the matter of this bulky volume is quite essential as a complete record of the acts of the Council, it serves in reality only to lead us up to the practical utterances of the assembled legislative body, which will form the subject of the chapters still to be published.

The main bulk of the present digest, that is, about 500 pages, consists of the consistorial acts; the Bulls of announcement and publication of the Synod; the invitations to the princes, to various orders of the hierarchy, and to the learned members of Congregations; the correspondence between the Holy See and the different active representatives of Church and State relative to the place of the Council, the rights, privileges, and exemptions claimed by various parties, the subjects to be discussed, the persons to be cited, the forms to be observed, etc. All these items and details are of singular interest, and give the student of the history of the Reformation period a characteristic insight into the difficulties with which the Church had to contend in those days. A separate and most instructive chapter of the volume is devoted to the labors of Paul III to effect an immediate reform among the members of the Roman Curia, as a prerequisite to advancing other reforms in the body of the Church. The Diary of Secretary B. Motta gives us a succinct account of the points discussed in the conferences held, and shows the gradual but decided process of purgation inaugurated by the Pontiff in the College of Cardinals, the Roman Chancery, and the whole clerical officialdom of that time. Not the least important, as indicative of the full freedom of speech and the broad views adopted by the Pope, are the articles embodying the objections which would probably be made against the proposed reforms, and the excuses advanced by prelates who might seek to withdraw themselves from the effects of the new legislation under the pretext of exempt jurisdiction, necessity of residence, and the like.

As an exact and complete reference contribution likely to facilitate the revision of the universal Church Law, even now preparing, the present volume is no less helpful than it is to the historian of the much-discussed age of the Reformation. A topical index of goodly extent is added as an indispensable complement to a work of this kind, which is, like all the Freiburg productions of Herder, printed and bound in royal style.

SOCIALISM. Its Theoretical Basis and Practical Application. By Victor Cathrein, S.J. Authorized translation of the eighth German edition. With special reference to the condition of Socialism in the United States. Revised and enlarged by Victor F. Gettelmann, S.J. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers. Pp. 424.

Since its first appearance, in 1890, the original of this book has passed through eight large editions and been translated into as many different languages. Besides this remarkable fecundity, it has enjoyed the distinction, rarely accorded to a work of its parentage, of a favorable reception amongst Protestant critics in Germany, and of high praise even from so prominent a socialist organ as the *Neue Zeit*, in which Kautsky writes that "Marx's theory has been rendered much better by Cathrein than by any of the liberalist 'socialist-killers.' The author has at least read the works which he discusses." The latter sentence signalizes, if not the book's primary claim to merit, certainly one that is quite obvious. Nearly every page evinces the author's familiarity with the principles, methods and demands of socialists, and that not simply as they are divulgated in Germany, but in every other country wherein their propaganda has been effected. His expositions of programmes and systems, though relatively succinct, are fairly comprehensive and clear. This is especially true in regard to the Marxian theories. The chief excellence, however, of the work seems to lie in its discussion of the philosophical bases of Socialism. Marx's materialistic conception of history, which, according to Engels, advanced Socialism to the rank of science; the liberalistic doctrine of human equality; the socialistic attitude toward religion, — these fundamental questions are treated with singular insight and clarity. Whether Socialism should be dignified by the title of a philosophy may be questioned. At all events it is *based* on ultimate so-called principles, and to overthrow these is to pull down at least the speculative side of its superstructure. That Socialism, however, is proposed as a practical measure of reform, a remedy for existing evils, goes without saying. This is, if not its only, surely its chief *raison d'être*. To grasp its remedial plans and methods and to envisage them in their actual adaptation to the complex conditions of human life is, for one outside the ranks, a by no means easy task. To this task the author has devoted much sustained energy. Over one-third of his book is given to a discussion of the remedial programme presented by socialists,—their plans for the organization of labor, theories of profit and progress, family life, education, and the like. That he will succeed

in convincing socialists of the impracticability of their measures is more than may be hoped for; but that he has seen far ahead and argued justly thereon no one can reasonably, we think, deny.

It remains to add a few words concerning the present translation. The preceding edition had been practically a reprint of the original form of the book, no account having been taken of the changes which the past decade had wrought in socialistic proposals. The latest edition embodies the substance and more than doubles the compass of the former issue. Besides being brought fully abreast with the present status of Socialism throughout Europe, it now includes a reliable account of the socialistic movement in the United States, and presents also other minor adaptations to American conditions. The editor has had the advantage of the author's personal coöperation, and the work of translating has likewise been carefully supervised, so that both the matter and the form have been well provided for. A somewhat severer castigation of the latter would not have been amiss. The English, while perfectly clear, is not as smooth as it might be, and retains just a smack of the German flavor. A good style makes one desiderate a better; a classic should be classically rendered.

What therefore with this philosophical and practical study of Socialism and the scholarly and literary essays on the same subject contributed by Dr. Kerby to volumes fourth and fifth of THE DOLPHIN, educated Catholic readers need feel themselves at no loss of means whereby "to orient" themselves in this most burning and far-reaching problem of the present age.

CATHOLIC IDEALS IN SOCIAL LIFE. By Father Cuthbert, O.S.F.C. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1904. Pp. 249.

Father Cuthbert gives expression to the Catholic mind upon certain questions of the hour which concern individual conduct and social life. In a popular yet dignified fashion he sketches for us the condition of the citizen, the workingman, the husband and the wife; likewise the reform movements in the social order and the apostolates which most effectually sustain the efforts of the true educator at the present time. In reviewing the latter topic the author finds excellent opportunity to discuss the elements of the Franciscan vocation and to show how the spirit of the Seraphic Saint still wields its powerful influence in counteracting the principal evils that afflict modern society. But Father Cuthbert's treatment of these subjects is not

intended to be systematic; he merely brings us face to face with the duty which well-known aspects of social life call forth according to the Catholic Ideal, and most readers will probably thank him for adopting this somewhat desultory and less scientific though more attractive method of presentation. To the priest he addresses himself in a distinct chapter on the subject of Social Reform. The priest views social problems in a somewhat different light from that of the economist. He takes account of spiritual forces which the political reformer naturally ignores, and he aims at a spiritual end which, however important in regulating practical issues upon their actual worth in the sight of God, necessarily escapes the popular leader concerned with outward and material conditions. The two views are not exclusive, but they are also not identical. Father Cuthbert pleads for a well-informed priesthood, a clergy which, whilst not permitting itself to be absorbed by externals, does not at the same time refuse to take due cognizance of progressive methods in reform legislation and the operations that improve the condition of the people, their homes, and their coöperative activity in community life. This knowledge will help the priest to make effective whatever is good in the efforts of the economical reformers, and to preserve his people from admitting those false maxims and motives of success which are being taught by the irreligious socialist.

Apart from this the priest's duty is, "in a preëminent degree, to maintain the sanctity of life amid all its jarring agitations. And this he can do only by keeping clearly before the minds of the people those evangelical principles which are so easily forgotten in the whirl of life. It is not his duty to create economic systems; his part in the work of social reform is to set men thinking of their spiritual and moral duties toward each other. His primary object is to teach the individual to apply the Gospel to his own personal life; or, in other words, to form a Christian conscience. Yet in doing this he is really reconstructing society, and the reconstruction he effects is the more permanent and truthful because it is based upon personal conviction and conscience" (p. 91). Father Cuthbert points some excellent lessons for the priestly reformer who is misled by his zeal for good to intemperate and inopportune denunciations of abuses against the natural or positive Christian law. "Our Divine Lord did not declare that wars must cease, but that all men should seek justice and righteousness. He knew that in proportion as men seek justice and righteousness, wars will cease. Neither did He forbid His followers to recognize

legal slavery; but He implanted in the hearts of His disciples the principle of fraternal charity, which in time makes slavery morally impossible." The same theory of admirable Gospel wisdom may be applied to the competitive system in commerce, monopoly, and the like crying evils which would necessarily cease to grow in an essentially Christian society. Acts of Parliament and Congress are necessary; but they only formulate laws; they cannot beget the motives that prompt their being kept.

The volume has much that is practical for all classes of readers, and deserves wide circulation.

THE RECENT DEVELOPMENT OF PHYSICAL SCIENCE. By Wm. Cecil Dampier Whetham, M.A., F.R.S., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. P. Blakiston's Son & Co., 1012 Walnut Street, Philadelphia. Pp. 344.

The opening of the present century welcomed a number of books in which the scientific achievements of its predecessor were summarized and popularized,—in some cases, it is true, with more regard on the author's part for rhetorical finish and dazzling effect than for exact science. The work here presented must be ranked with no such *fin de siècle* vulgarizations. The author indeed has had in mind the wants, and it may be added the limitations, of the general reader. He has accordingly endeavored, and with fair success, to convey facts and inferences of physical science in an interesting, or, in the better sense of the term, popular, manner. And instead of roaming over the meads of science, gathering merely the sweet nosegays of pretty flowers, he has limited himself to one section of the great domain, that is, to physical science. He has confined himself, too, to just a few fruits, yet not altogether omitting the flowers; and of these the mode of growth rather than fair form and coloring have held his attention. In other words, he is concerned rather with methods than results, rightly deeming it that a superficial acquaintance with results without an underlying knowledge of method is useless, or worse than useless.

From this viewpoint and with this animus he enters upon the following problems: The liquefaction of gases—for instance, air and hydrogen—is described for the light it throws on the physical equilibrium between the so-called states of matter,—solid, liquid, and gaseous. Next, the phenomena of fusion and solidification of mixtures and alloys are considered in their bearing on the theory of equilibrium,

and additional light is seen thence to fall on the practical arts of metallurgy, whilst the further study of solution in general brings in electrical phenomena and the theory of ionic conduction. This enables one to see further into electrolysis and certain important physiological processes. A fuller study of the ionic and electronic structure of atoms seems to bring almost to a reality the peripatetic doctrine of primal matter (*materia prima*), while the theory of radio-activity is recognized as the modern equivalent of the transmutation of substances dreamed of by the mediæval alchemists. The "scientific imagination" penetrates further into the ultimates of matter when it comes to picture atoms as infinitesimal systems of electrons,—corpuscles which themselves are described as just centres of "intrinsic ætherial strain." Physics has already reached out to the stars and annexed them to its domain. By the aid of the spectroscope it examines the chemism of sun and stars, measures their motions, and speculates about their origin, development and decay. Thus from the inner make-up of the atom to the majestic progress of the suns the visualization of the universe becomes fairly continuous and, so far as present information extends, consistent and on the whole plausible. How all this picture of phenomena comports with the ultimate questionings of the mind is happily suggested in the following verses:

We scatter the mists that enclose us,
  Till the seas are ours and the lands,
Till the quivering æther knows us,
  And carries our quick commands.
From the blaze of the sun's bright glory
  We sift each ray of light,
We steal from the stars their story
  Across the dark spaces of night.

But beyond the bright search-lights of science,
  Out of sight of the windows of sense,
Old riddles still bid us defiance,
  Old questions of Why and of Whence.
There fail all sure means of trial,
  There end all the pathways we've trod,
Where man, by belief or denial,
  Is weaving the purpose of God.

HISTORY OF THE REDEMPTORISTS AT ANNAPOLIS, Md., from 1853 to 1903. With a short historical sketch of the preceding one hundred and fifty years of Catholicity in the Capital of Maryland. By a Redemptorist Father. Illustrated. Ilchester, Md.: College Press. 1904. Pp. 253.

Simultaneously with the beautiful *Vita di S. Gerardo Majella* published by the Roman Postulator, P. Claudio Benedetti, of the Redemptorist Congregation, in which historical and edifying light is shed upon the early period of the development of the Order, there appears a history that illustrates the other extreme of its activity both in time and space. Thus the two volumes stand in a manner as representative of the missionary zeal inspired by St. Alphonsus, of its lasting effects, its universality which knows no difference of nation or clime, of its twofold agency in promoting personal sanctification and in procuring the salvation of the masses, of its power to elevate lay ministration no less than priestly fidelity. We shall have something to say elsewhere of P. Benedetti's volume ; here we must confine ourselves to brief remarks upon the work which singles out Annapolis as a centre of missionary activity in the New World.

It it now little more than fifty years since the Redemptorist Fathers settled in Annapolis.

By a happy accident they obtained ownership of the mansion which had belonged to the last surviving Signer of the Declaration of Independence, the venerable Charles Carroll of Carrollton. Thus the description of their first Maryland house and the development of Catholic life from it suggested to the author to combine the treatment of the history of Catholicity in the Capital of Maryland with the narrative of the religious and domestic growth of the Redemptorist Community there.

After a brief introduction, sketching the conditions of first settlement under Lord Baltimore and the disfranchisement of the Catholics from 1689 to the beginnings of the American Revolution, we are made familiar with the persons and character of the Carroll family whose home sheltered the first missionary growth under the Jesuit Fathers in that region. The subsequent chapters take up in regular order the domestic, educational, parochial, and missionary events from 1853 to 1903. It is not expedient to enter here into details of the history, but there attaches a certain religious interest to the entire account, which brings before us many notable personages and pictures graphically the happy conventual life of the community of priests and brothers.

It is a book not merely for special friends of the Redemptorist Order, but for the ecclesiastical student generally, as showing the advance made by one of the most influential religious communities in America during a half century beset with many and grave difficulties for the early missionaries, hardly lessened by the air of religious freedom in which they rejoiced.

THE PULPIT ORATOR: Containing seven elaborate Skeleton Sermons, or, Homiletic, Dogmatic, Liturgical, Symbolical and Moral Sketches, for every Sunday in the year. Also elaborate Skeleton Sermons for the Chief Festivals and other Occasions. By the Rev. John Evang. Zollner. Translated by the Rev. Augustine Wirth, O.S.B. Tenth, Revised Edition. Vols. I to VI. New York and Cincinnati: Fred. Pustet & Co.

Collections of sermons are probably the class of books to which the average clerical purchaser of current literature is most easily attracted. They promise to relieve him of much labor in a task which constantly renews its demands for originality or novelty, whilst the time for deliberate preparation is often wanting. Moreover, there is no lessening of the reponsibility of the preacher; and whatever may cause him to fail, he cannot plead excuse before his audience. In these circumstances he must have at hand such assistance as will allow him to do justice both to himself and his hearers by presenting solid and well-ordered thought in his regular sermons or instructions. He may equip himself in one of two ways: by simply memorizing the sermon of another, or else by the study of a system which will enable him to seize the material around him and convert it to immediate use for preaching.

The method of memorizing sermons written by others has its serious disadvantages. It makes of the preacher an actor whose words impress the hearer in proportion as the speaker is capable of entering into the sentiment they express. This is a rare gift, and even when fully possessed arouses in the intelligent listener who recognizes the process of artificial acquisition in the very perfection of uttered form, that subtle sense of comparison with the automatic gramophone. It is quite true that to a man in good faith, or to a man of superior religious motives, it matters not who speaks the truth or how it is prompted; he assimilates what is said; but the people to whom we mostly preach are those who *need* faith and superior spiritual motives, and our object is to gain their assent to what is our conviction.

The better way by far to prepare a sermon is to force the intellect

to some thinking and to use such words as are prompted by the conviction that thus results in our sensitive nature. Effective logical thinking does not preclude the use of the thoughts of others as a stimulant, as suggestion, or as food for argument and illustration. Quite the contrary. But in order that written sermons may enable the preacher to think and to present his thought to others, not as an actor who merely recites, but as a teacher who is anxious to convey a sentiment because he feels deeply what he says, it is essential that the borrowed thoughts should be placed before his mind's eye in an organic fashion. He should see the reasons of the composition, its integral collected parts, the dependence of one point upon the other, and the general purpose of each division in its relation to the whole. This is effected by the use of skeletons, by analytical arrangement, by clear-cut divisions in which the main thoughts are grouped under definite headings, allowing a complete survey of the train of reasoning and illustration which the preacher is to follow. Among the class of sermon books that serve the priest and missionary in this way, stimulating his intellect to action, and furnishing him with abundant matter, Zollner's large collection of sermon sketches takes a leading place. These sermons instruct in the art of composition, whilst they supply doctrine, argument, and examples which the preacher may use with the assurance that the matter is apt and sound. Father Lambing, who is a good judge, in his preface speaks of these sermons in words of high praise, as a complete preacher's arsenal, supplying him with method and matter on all sorts of topics for divers times and occasions. The fact of this translation having passed through ten editions vouches for the practical estimate which the clergy have put on the publication in the past, and there is no reason why this estimate should grow less in the future.

TWENTY-NINE CHATS AND ONE SCOLDING. By the Rev. Fred. C. O'Neill. New York: Christian Press Association Publishing Company. 1905. Pp. 291.

Here is a writer who has the rare faculty of the Aesopian fabulist, and the still rarer gift of adapting the lessons which he draws from fable or fairyland to the spiritual needs of children. It is an old saying that the heart of the true priest is the heart of a mother, and Father O'Neill makes the statement good in the way he leads the young folks to examine their conduct by comparison with the living things in nature or with such fancies as appeal to the youthful imagina-

tion and make fiction a reality at least for the time, and for a purpose which ennobles motives and acts upon the formation of character. Even where the language is too choice for the limited educational experience of the child—a feature which the author might easily alter—the affectionate manner of approach to his readers and the genial glow with which the author surrounds his creations serve to attract the attention, and convey the lesson of early self-discipline which he wishes to inculcate. The "Scolding" which concludes the series of thirty short stories, having throughout a mythical but pleasant ring to them, is a good-natured intimation that little boys are no better than little girls, unless they practise what the story-teller has taught them; and that both boys and girls need to improve in all that pertains to solid progress and virtue.

The book is well printed and makes a useful gift to all who are young in heart and have the understanding of a bright American child. We trust Father O'Neill will do more in this field, which needs most assiduous cultivation, because our Juvenile Literature is very scant and much of it is puerile and insipid when compared with that of the secular story writers for children in the English language.

Literary Chat.

The Abbé Letourneau has just published through Victor Lecoffre (Paris) a volume dealing with the pastoral ministry of Père Olier, founder of the Community and Seminary of Saint Sulpice. The material is taken in the main from M. Faillou's well-known biography of the saintly priest, published thirty years ago, which likewise had served Healy Thompson for his English version a few years later. In an epilogue the present French author sketches the actual condition of the parish of Saint Sulpice to-day, which, though it has been repeatedly divided since M. Olier's time, two hundred and fifty years ago, still counts 39,000 souls. Nevertheless the method as well as the spirit of the saintly priest who then organized the immense parish-work is still being maintained through the zeal of the Sulpician Fathers, and it is interesting to study the details of their apostolate as shown in the arrangement of daily, weekly and monthly parochial exercises, and the kind and division of pastoral labor calculated to reach every need of the souls in the district. We learn from the author that a new large biography of Père Olier is in preparation by a priest of Saint Sulpice.

A new edition of P. Noldin's *Summa Theologiae Moralis* has just been issued. The work has proved itself certainly very popular among students of theology, as appears from the extraordinary fact that the third volume is now in its fifth edition of 4,000, whilst of the first two volumes a double edition is being published simulta-

neously. In point of systematic arrangement and typographical perfection the work can hardly be excelled,—an item which is of unquestionable importance in a class-book whereby the preferences of the teacher and pupil in the choice of a regular text are frequently determined. The Innsbruck theologian has demonstrated his title as a judicious authority, especially in matters which touch the penal canon code, with its complicated interpretation of censures and irregularities, a subject which requires separate treatment in these pages. (Pustet & Co.)

The spirit of historical inquiry is growing in all parts of the country, and Catholic parish histories published from time to time under the auspices of diocesan or literary societies contribute no inconsiderable share to the information which incidentally describes the industrial and educational progress of our people. A recent addition to this field, and of considerable importance to the historical student of culture in New England, is the memorial volume of the one hundredth anniversary of Holy Cross Church in Boston. That church was the mother of the present Cathedral, was, in fact, for more than fifty years, the Bishop's parish church. Its school, which was opened in 1820, was the first Catholic school in New England, and around its sanctuary cluster the most illustrious names in the annals of Catholic America during the past century, from Archbishop Carroll, who dedicated it in 1803, to John Williams, who graces it with undiminished dignity in the spirit of his great predecessors—Cheverus, Fenwick, and Fitzpatrick. The volume is published by the New England Catholic Historical Society, 1904.

Biblische Zeitschrift, the new organ of "Biblical Studies," founded two years ago by members of the Catholic Faculty in the University of Munich, opens its eighth number with an excellent interpretation of the narrative of the Tower of Babel (Gen. 2 : 1–9) by Dr. O. Happel. The author departs, on critical grounds, from the traditional literal sense of the passage, and shows that the "tower" stands for civic unity attempted in the foundation of a great commonwealth made up of different nomadic tribes seeking to establish a central capital in the plain of Sinear. The Cistercian Father Erasmus Nagl (Vienna) reopens the question which Dr. Belser seemed to have settled, regarding the duration of our Lord's public life. He maintains, however, the 7th of April, 783 A.U.C., or the year 30 of our Era, as the date of Christ's death. The two volumes of the *Zeitschrift* thus far published (B. Herder, $3.50, four numbers a year) represent a fair amount of Biblical matter, treated from the viewpoint of recent criticism and Catholic scholarship, which we must gradually assimilate, although much of it appears to be contrary to old traditions. These traditions are not to be confounded with the teaching or authority of the Church, even though they are deeply rooted in popular belief, because there has not until recently been made any attempt to view them in an historical light.

Dr. Charles Thwing, President of the Western Reserve University, suggests (*Harper's*) the possibility of our leading colleges forming "trusts" in educational commodities. Applied to higher education the system would mean the best use of endowments by controlling the financial investments of the separate institutions of learn-

ing united under one management; and it would likewise call out all the resources of different teaching staffs and the student bodies. Among Catholics the system of separate Religious Orders would naturally prevent such amalgamation of colleges, except in the manner of their being grouped around some central university, such as that at Washington. Still there is no reason why eminent and tried professors of one institution should not be called upon to give courses in their specialties to students of another institution by an arrangement of terms which would permit a regular succession of teachers.

The *Early English Text Society* is just forty years in existence. It was started by Dr. Furnivall of England for the purpose of bringing the immense treasures of forgotten Old English literature within the reach of the modern student. Looking over the work that the Society has thus far done one is struck by the amount of Catholic publications contained in the list of reprints and first editions of MSS. It is certainly humiliating to find that with all our clamoring about what the Catholic clergy and the early monastic institutes did for literary culture, there are hardly any representatives of either body among those who promote to-day the revival of this culture which should be most our own care and prerogative. Dr. Furnivall himself began the work by publishing the fifteenth century text of *Arthur Wright's Chaste Wife*, a collection of *political, religious and love poems; Hymns to the Virgin and Christ, Parliament of Devils*, the *Stacions of Rome, Early English Meals and Manners*, Lovelich's *History of the Holy Grail*, Caxton's *Book of Curtesye*, etc. Besides these interesting publications the Society has on its list numerous Anglo-Saxon Psalters, Homilies, Lives of Saints, Ailred's Rule of Nuns, Monastic Diaries, etc., to be edited and annotated by Protestant commentators because competent Catholic editors are for the most part not accessible, if there be any.

During a recent convention of American educators at Northwestern University (Evanston, Ill.), Professor Coe, of that institution, speaking of the necessity of religious education and of the public school as a conserving element of honorable citizenship, said: "A school that ignores religion, though the purpose be simply that of being neutral, cultivates a divided self in the pupil. A school that develops a purely secular consciousness violates the whole principle of continuity in education; it represents in aggravated form the isolation of the school from life and from other educational agencies. It does more than that. For to develop a purely secular consciousness is not to remain neutral toward religion, but to oppose it by setting up a set of rival standards. In a word, there is not, and there cannot be, a school that, in its influence upon its pupils, is neutral with respect to religion. In some way, then, our State schools must coöperate with home and church, else our educational system is no system at all, but only a truce between rival clans." This is strong, yet true, language. Professor Coe proposes that the Bible be read in the schools, at least such passages of it as appeal to the common consciousness of the people. We do not believe that this either meets his own objection against the irreligiousness of neutral schools, or lessens the danger of bigotry. Religion is not inculcated by merely reading the Bible; it must pervade the entire teaching and aid in the education of character, as is done in the Catholic school.

Dom Raphael Molitor, a member of the Benedictine Abbey at Beuren, famous for its school of Christian art, has written a pamphlet entitled "Our Position: A Word in Reference to the Plain Chant Question," which is published simultaneously in English and German (Pustet). In this brochure of about fifty pages the author answers some of the objections of critics who would persuade the musical world that the *Motu Proprio* of Pius X cannot be carried out unless we conjure up very extraordinary conditions; and that in any case nothing should be done until we have the new Vatican edition of the Gregorian Chant books being presently prepared by the Commission at Rome. Dom Molitor, who is of course in entire sympathy with his Benedictine brothers of the Solesmes school, shows us by illustration what the Vatican edition is likely to be, and how little it will differ essentially from the Gregorian or Plain Chant, which has been used successfully in Germany. He points out the advantages of a uniform style of chanting the liturgical offices which are likely to result from the obligatory use of the Vatican edition; and he shows that the ancient melodies are by no means so very difficult as is generally assumed.

Saints and Festivals of the Christian Church, by P. Brewster, is an illustrated volume published by the Frederick A. Stokes Company, of New York, giving a good survey of the Christian symbolism which marked the mediæval calendar series of the Catholic Church. There is also a "Chronological List of the Bishops and Popes of the Christian Church from the Death of St. Peter," and an "Alphabetical Index of Canonized Saints and Others." Singularly enough, the book comes from an author who is not in communion with the Catholic Church; although there is nothing in its pages distinctly to indicate Protestant views.

Books Received.

THEOLOGICAL AND ASCETICAL.

SUMMA THEOLOGIAE MORALIS. Scholarum Usui. Tom. I—De Principiis Theologiae Moralis; Complementum Primum,—De Sexto Praecepto et de Usu Matrimonii; Complementum Secundum,—De Poenis Ecclesiasticis; II—De Praeceptis; III—De Sacramentis. Accommodavit H. Noldin, S.J., S. Theologiae professor in Universitate Oenipontana. Editio tertia et quarta. Cum approbatione Episcopi Brixinensis et Superiorem Ordinis. Oeniponte: Fel. Rauch (C. Pustet); Ratisbone, Romae, Neo-Eboraci et Cincinnati: Frid. Pustet. 1904. Pp.: Tom. I—356—100—123; II—800; III—796. Pretium, $7.50.

DIE PARABELN DES HERRN IM EVANGELIUM exegetisch und praktisch erläutert von Leopold Fonck, S.J., Dr. theol. et phil., ord. Professor der Theologie an der Universität Innsbruck. Zweite, vielfach verbesserte und vermehrteAuflage. (Drittes und viertes Tausend.) Mit Gutheissung der kirchlichen Obrigkeit und einem Geleitswort des hochwürdigsten Bishofs von Rottenburg. Innsbruck: Fel. Rauch (K. Pustet); Regensburg, Rom, New York, und Cincinnati: Fried. Pustet. 1904. Pp. 903. Preis, $2.15.

LE MINISTÈRE PASTORAL DE JEAN-JACQUES OLIER, Curé de Saint-Sulpice, 1642–1652. Nouvelle édition publiée par G. Letourneau, Curé de Saint-Sulpice. Paris: Victor Lecoffre. 1905. Pp. 223. Prix, 2 francs.

JURISPRUDENTIA ECCLESIASTICA AD USUM ET COMMODITATEM utriusque Cleri auctore P. Petro Mocchegiani, O.F.M., S. Indulgentiarum Congregationis Consultore. Tomus I—Ad Claras Aguas ex Typis Collegii S. Bonaventurae. Friburgi Brisgov. et St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder. 1904. Pp. 767. Pretium, $4.50.

DER KATHOLISCHE WETTBEWERB UM DIE HOEHERE BILDUNG UND DIE MODERNE GESELLSCHAFT. Eine Ansprache an die Mitglieder und Freunde der Albertus Magnus Vereine. Von Dr. Hermann Grauert. Freiburg, Strassburg, München, und St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder. 1904.

VERA SAPIENTIA, or True Wisdom. Translated from the Latin of Thomas à Kempis by the Right Rev. Mgr. Byrne, D.D., V.G., Adelaide, South Australia. London: R. & T. Washbourne; New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1904. Pp. 204.

THE GOSPEL APPLIED TO OUR TIMES. A Sermon for every Sunday in the Year. By the Rev. D. S. Phelan. St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder. 1904. Pp. 473. Price, $2.00

PERFECT CONTRITION. A Golden Key of Heaven for all Good Christian People. By the Rev. J. Von den Driesch. With Preface by the Rev. A. Lehmkuhl, S.J. Translated by the Rev. J. Slater, S.J. St Louis, Mo.: B. Herder. 1904. Pp. 31. Price, each, $0.05; per dozen, $0.45.

PROGRESS IN PRAYER. Translated from *Instructions Spirituelles* par le R. P. Caussade, S.J., by L. V. Sheehan. Adapted and edited with an Introduction by the Rev. Joseph McSorley, C.S.P. St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder. 1904. Pp. 178. Price, $0.75.

SONGS OF THE BIRTH OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST. With Illustrations by Albrecht Dürer. Nelson, N. H.: The Monadnock Press. 1904. Pp. 81. Price, boards, $0.50 *net*; leather, $1.00 *net*.

EL AVERROISMO TEOLOGICO DE STO. TOMAS DE AQUINO. Extracto del homenaje A. D. Francesco Codera. En su jubilación del profesorado. Miguel Asin y Palacios. 1904. Pp. 331.

THE GOSPEL OF THE CHILDHOOD OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST. With Original Text of the Manuscript at the Monastery of St. Wolfgang. Translated from the Latin by Henry Copley Greene. An Introduction by Alice Meynell, and a Cover and Illustrations by Carlos Schwabe. New York: Scott-Thaw Co.; London: Burns & Oates, Ltd. 1904. Pp. 272. Price, $1.25 *net*.

THE PULPIT ORATOR. Containing Seven Elaborate Skeleton Sermons, or Homiletic, Dogmatical, Liturgical, Symbolical, and Moral Sketches for every Sunday of the Year. Also Elaborate Skeleton Sermons for the Chief Festivals and other occasions. By the Rev. John Ev. Zollner. Translated and adapted by the Rev. Augustine Wirth, O.S.B. With Preface by the Rev. A. A. Lambing. Tenth revised edition. New York and Cincinnati: Fred. Pustet & Co. 1904. Price, $12.00 for the complete set, six volumes, bound.

LITURGICAL.

ORDO 1905. Divini Officii Recitandi Missaeque Celebrandae. Juxta rubricas emendatas Breviarii Missalisque Romani. Cum officiis votivis ex indulto. Tam pro clero saeculari Statuum Foederatorum officiis generalibus hic concessis utente, quam pro iis quibus Kalendarium proprium clero Romano concessum est. Pro Anno Domini MCMV. New York and Cincinnati: Fr. Pustet & Co. Pp. 131. Price, $0.50

ORDO 1905. Divini Officii Recitandi Missaeque Celebrandae. Juxta rubricas emendatas breviarii Missalisque Romani. Cum officiis votivis ex indulto pro clero saeculari Statuum Foederatorum officiis generalibus hic concessis utente concessus. Pro Anno Domini MCMV. New York and Cincinnati: Fr. Pustet & Co. Pp. 104. Price, $0.35.

PHILOSOPHY.

DIE MODERNE BIOLOGIE und die Entwicklungstheorie. Von Erich Wasmann, S.J. Zweite, vermehrte Auflage. Mit Illustrationen. Freiburg Brisg. und St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder. 1904. Pp. 328. Price, $1.25.

AUS HÖRSAAL UND SCHULSTUBE. Gesammelte kleinere Schriften zur Erziehungs- und Unterrichtslehre. Von Dr. Otto Willmann. Freiburg Brisg. und St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder. 1904. Pp. 328. Price, $1.30.

AGREEMENT OF EVOLUTION AND CHRISTIANITY. By Samuel Louis Phillips, A.B., Princeton, author of *The Testimony of Reason*, etc. Washington, D. C.: The Phillips Company. 1904. Pp. x—197. Price, $1.00.

SOCIALISM. Its Theoretical Basis and Practical Application. By Victor Cathrein, S.J. Authorized Translation of the Eighth German Edition; with Special Reference to the Condition of Socialism in the United States. Revised and enlarged by Victor F. Gettelmann, S.J. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers. Pp. 424. Price, $1.50 net.

HISTORY.

HISTORY OF THE REDEMPTORISTS AT ANNAPOLIS, MD., from 1853 to 1903. With a Short Historical Sketch of the Preceding One Hundred and Fifty Years of Catholicity in the Capital of Maryland. Written by a Redemptorist Father. Illustrated. Ilchester, Md.: College Press. 1904. Pp. 253.

CHRISTOPH GEWOLD. Ein Beitrag zur Gelehrtengeschichte der Gegenreformation und zur Geschichte des Kampfes um di pfälzische Kur. Von Dr. Anton Dürrwächter, Professor am Kgl. Lyceum in Bamberg. Freiburg im Breisg., Strassburg, München und St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder. 1904. Pp. 134. Price, $0.70 *net.*

MEMORIAL VOLUME OF THE ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION OF THE DEDICATION OF THE CHURCH OF THE HOLY CROSS, BOSTON. Published by the New England Catholic Historical Society: Boston. 1904. Pp. 143.

THE MIDDLE AGES. Sketches and Fragments. By the V. Rev. Thomas J. Shahan, S.T.D., Professor in the Catholic University. New York, Cincinnati and Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1904. Pp. 432. Price, $2.00.